

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6665

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 30, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

5 (a) By striking out "1950" and inserting in lieu thereof
6 "1954".

7 (b) By striking out the word "twenty-one" and insert-
8 ing in lieu thereof "22 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

9 SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
10 of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

11 (a) By striking out the period at the end of subsec-

1 tion (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and adding
2 the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other
3 provision of this Act, no State acreage allotment for 1954
4 shall be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in the
5 State in 1952 by more than $29\frac{1}{2}$ per centum and the addi-
6 tional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national
7 acreage allotment and the production from such acreage
8 shall be in addition to the national marketing quota, and in
9 establishing future State acreage allotments the total acre-
10 age planted in any State in excess of the acreage that would
11 have been allotted except for this proviso shall not be counted.
12 The provisions of this subsection relating to 1954 only shall
13 not apply in the establishment of acreage allotments and
14 marketing quotas for extra long staple cotton under sec-
15 tion 347 of this Act."

16 (b) By changing subsection (e) by inserting after the
17 words "and conditions" the language "(except those relat-
18 ing only to 1954)" and by striking the period at the end of
19 such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and
20 adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to
21 prevent hardship."

22 (c) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon
23 before the word "*Provided*" and inserting in lieu thereof
24 a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acre-

1 age allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hard-
2 ship:”.

3 (d) By adding two new paragraphs “(6)” and “(7)”
4 at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

5 “(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1)
6 and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recom-
7 mends such action and the Secretary determines that such
8 action will facilitate the effective administration of the Act
9 and result in a more equitable distribution of the county
10 allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage
11 allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3)
12 of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which
13 cotton has been planted in any one of the three years im-
14 mediately preceding the year for which such allotment is
15 determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on
16 the farm during such three year period. If the county acre-
17 age allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county
18 in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acre-
19 age reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be
20 used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which
21 are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under
22 this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in
23 paragraph (3).

24 “(7) For 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage

1 allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this sec-
 2 tion on which cotton will not be produced and which is
 3 voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be
 4 deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be
 5 reappportioned by the county committee to other farms in
 6 the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined
 7 by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on
 8 the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equip-
 9 ment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation
 10 practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the
 11 production of cotton. Any transfer of allotments under
 12 this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for
 13 any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is
 14 transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an
 15 allotment for failure to produce cotton during a three-year
 16 period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase
 17 the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which
 18 the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That notwithstanding
 19 any other provisions of this Act, any part of any farm acre-
 20 age allotment may be permanently released in writing to the
 21 county committee by the owner and operator of the farm,
 22 and reappportioned as provided herein."

A BILL

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

By Mr. HOPE

JULY 30, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued August 3, 1953

For actions of July 31 & Aug. 1, 1953

83rd-1st, Nos. 145 and 146

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	Foreign trade.....	84	Reorganization..	4,18,20,32
.....12,14,37,38,49, 58	Forestry..	17,34,42,64,69,83	Research.....	51
Commodity exchanges...9,48	Fruit.....	89	Safety.....	8,22
Corn quotas.....11,14,52	Immigration.....	3,23	Social security.....	36
Cotton allotments.....5	Labor, farm.....	7,28,55	Soil cons. .	13,65,70,74,80
Crop insurance.....24	Loans, farm.....	4,20,29,34,54,61,67	Storage facilities.....	40
Debt limit..1,19,31,68,79, 92	Meat packing.....	71	Surpluses.....	63,66,86
Economic Advisers.....73	Monination.....	30	Taxation.....	50
Education.....35,57	Payrolling.....	50	Tobacco.....	93
Electricity...45,60,77, 90	Penalty mail.....	33	Trade agreements.....	53
Expenditures.....75	Personnel.....	6,44,81	Training, farm.....	88
Farm machinery.....76	Potato supports.....	10,47	Treaty powers.....	43,85
Farm program.....39,45	Price supports....	10,47,67	Water.....	60,62,80,90
Foundations study.....56	Property, surplus.....	32	Weather control.....	15,26
Foreign aid.....	Reclamation....	16,17,25,27	Wheat agreement.....	91
.....2,12,18,21,30,78				

HIGHLIGHTS: Congressional action was completed on bills to reorganize FCA, provide famine relief, permit refugee immigration, expand crop insurance, study weather control, modify reclamation units, require penalty-mail payments, authorize forest loans, transfer cotton field station, extend fur-farmer loans, extend Mexican farm-labor program. House adopted conference reports on supplemental appropriations, foreign-aid appropriations, trade agreements. House passed bills to increase debt limit and modify corn and cotton quotas. Senate passed farm-tenant interest bill. Congress received President's messages on conservation and social security. Senate received Benson letter asking farm-program recommendations. House committee reported onion-marketing and potato-support bills. Bills were introduced on grazing procedures, soil-water conservation, and surplus disposal.

HOUSE - July 31

- DEBT LIMIT.** Passed, 239-158, without amendment H. R. 6672, increasing the U. S. statutory debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion (pp. 10964-87, 11009).
- FAMINE RELIEF.** Agreed, 143-15, to the conference report on S. 2249, to enable the President, during the period ending Mar. 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the U. S. emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements. The overall-limitation of \$100,000,000 remains; but the limit of \$20,000,000 for any one country was eliminated. Language was inserted to make it clear that the authority of CCC to deliver commodities under the bill is limited to the delivery of such commodities aboard vessels in U. S. ports. Therefore, all costs incurred in making delivery of the commodities after they have been placed on board will have to be paid either by the recipient countries or from USA or other funds, and the \$100,000,000 limit will apply only to CCC investment and costs. Because of this action the conferees eliminated the provision that at least half of the shipments be made on U. S.-flag ships, since USA already follows this policy. (pp. 10992-3).

3. **IMMIGRATION.** Agreed, 190-44, to the conference report on H. R. 6481, to admit into the U. S. for permanent residence up to 214,000 refugees, orphans, and certain close relatives of U. S. citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence (pp. 10988-991).
4. **FCA REORGANIZATION.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4353, to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration, etc. (pp. 10991-2). For provisions of report, see Digest 144.
5. **COTTON ALLOTMENTS.** Passed without amendment H. R. 6665, which provides that the national cotton acreage allotment for 1954 will be 22,500,000 acres (basic), that no State will receive an acreage cut of more than 29.5% below its 1952 acreage (the acreage for this is to be in addition to the national allotment), that State acreage reserves shall be used in addition to other purposes for correcting inequities in farm allotments, that with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture county committees may apportion farm acreage allotments on the basis of previous farm history, and that for 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to any farm which is voluntarily surrendered by the operator of that farm, may be reallocated to other farms in the county (pp. 10932-40). The bill had been reported without amendment by the Agriculture Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1058)(p. 11009).
6. **PERSONNEL.** Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 6185, to require that veterans attain a passing grade before becoming eligible for civil-service appointments (pp. 10963-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. **FARM LABOR.** Received the conference report on H. R. 3480, to extend the Mexican farm-labor program. The conferees agreed on an extension for 2 years instead of the House period of 3 years and the Senate period of 1 year. (p. 10993.)
8. **SAFETY.** Received the conference report on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (pp. 10993-5).
9. **COMMODITY EXCHANGES.** The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6435, to extend the Commodity Exchange Act to onions (p. D823).
10. **POTATO SUPPORTS.** The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 3895, to remove the prohibition against price supports on Irish potatoes (p. D823).
11. **CORN QUOTAS.** The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. J. Res. 321, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the date of the proclamation of corn marketing quotas. The "Daily Digest" states: "Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture must determine whether or not such quotas are necessary and make his proclamation not later than November 15 of the year prior to that in which quotas are to be invoked. This measure will postpone the 1954 proclamation until February 1, 1954, and is designed to give Congress an opportunity to reexamine the quota law before the Secretary is required to make his determination." (p. D823.)
12. **FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954.** Agreed, 237-156, to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6391, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 10920-8). For provisions of the report see Digest 144.
13. **CONSERVATION.** Received from the President a message favoring additional conservation and development of land and water resources, etc. (H. Doc. 221)(pp. 90923-9).

ADJUST COTTON MARKETING QUOTAS

JULY 31, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6665]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 8, change "22½" to "twenty-two and one-half".

Page 2, line 8, change the comma following the word "quota" to a period and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "facilitate the effective administration of the Act and".

STATEMENT

The present United States cotton supply situation indicates that marketing quotas will be required on the 1954 cotton crop. The carryover of cotton in the United States on August 1, 1953, will be approximately 5.6 million bales. If the production from the 1953 crop exceeds some 11½ to 12 million bales, the law would require the proclamation of marketing quotas for 1954. With the present rate of disappearance and a normal yield from the acreage in cotton on July 1, 1953, the national marketing quota for the 1954 crop would be 10 million bales, the minimum quota under the present law.

The national acreage allotment which would result from converting 10 million bales on the basis of average yields would be approximately 17½ million acres. A national acreage allotment of this size would mean that the average reduction in 1954 from the acreage planted to cotton in 1952 would be approximately 35 percent. A reduction of

this size in 1 year would be too severe for the cotton economy of the country. It would also create extreme hardship on the part of many farmers in many areas of the Cotton Belt. The bill, therefore, provides for a minimum national acreage allotment for 1954 of 22½ million acres.

Cotton marketing quotas were last in effect in 1950. During the past 3 years there have been substantial increases in cotton acreages in the western area of the Cotton Belt. Under the present law State acreage allotments for 1954 are required to be established on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12) in 1947, 1948, 1950, 1951, and 1952, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions. There is no provision in existing law to adjust for trends other than such adjustment as results from the moving 5-year average. The committee recognizes that special provisions are necessary to give appropriate effect to the recent shifts in cotton production. To this end, the bill provides that no States would be reduced in 1954 below its 1952 acreage by more than 29½ percent.

Under the present law the county cotton acreage allotment (less a reserve) is apportioned to farms primarily on the basis of a uniform county cropland factor. This method of allotment has been found to be inadequate in many counties. Therefore, there has been included in the bill a provision which would permit the county committee with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion the county allotment on the basis of farm cotton acreage history for the 3 years preceding the year for which the allotment is established.

It is contemplated that in most instances the county acreage allotment, less the reserve acreages, will be apportioned to farms on the basis of the farm acreage history rather than a uniform percentage of cropland. In counties where substantially all the cotton farms plant cotton regularly and generally devote similar percentages of their cropland to cotton production, the cropland basis is usually a satisfactory method of apportionment. However, in counties where there is diversified farming which has resulted in wide variations of the percentage of cropland planted to cotton on different farms, or where there are areas in a county where the cotton farmers generally plant substantially different percentages of their cropland to cotton, the acreage history approach to farm allotments should be used.

The exact acreage which each State would be allotted under this bill has not been calculated, since the Secretary is authorized to adjust State cotton acreages during the base period for abnormal weather conditions, and the acreage planted to cotton in 1950 in each State is subject to certain adjustments under subsections (f) (4) and (5), (g) (3) and (i) of section 344 of the present bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

National marketing quota

Section 1 of the bill provides that the minimum marketing quota for 1954 shall not be less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment of 22.5 acres. This minimum for the 1954 crop is applicable to upland cotton and does not apply in any way to extra-long-staple cotton.

Minimum State acreage allotments

Section 344 (b) of the act now requires that the national acreage allotment shall be apportioned to States on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period. Under the provisions of this subsection, the applicable years for the 1954 crop would be 1947, 1948, 1950, 1951, and 1952, since Public Law 28, 81st Congress, excludes the 1949 cotton acreage from the base period. After the national acreage allotment is apportioned in this manner, the bill would require increases in certain State acreage allotments so that the 1954 allotment for no State would be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in 1952 by more than 29½ percent. The additional acreage required to provide these minimum State acreage allotments would be over and above the national acreage allotment for the 1954 crop. The minimum provisions of subsection (b) would not be applicable to the apportionment of State acreage allotments to counties or in the establishment of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for extra-long-staple cotton.

Adjustments for inequities and hardship

Section 2 of the bill also provides that the State acreage reserve shall be used, in addition to the uses to which such reserve may be put under existing law, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship. Provision is also made to permit the use of the county reserve in adjusting farm allotments to correct inequities and prevent hardship.

Apportionment of the county acreage allotments to farms on the basis of farm acreage history

The bill provides that if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in more equitable allotments, the county acreage allotment shall be apportioned to farms on the basis of cotton farm acreage history for the preceding 3 years. Provision is also made for the county reserve to be used in the same manner irrespective of whether the county allotment is apportioned to farms on the basis of cropland or farm cotton acreage history.

Release and reapportionment of farm acreage allotments

The bill provides that for 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to a farm which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee may be reapportioned by the committee to other farms in the same county in amounts determined by the committee to be fair and reasonable in relation to the past acreage of cotton and other specified factors. Any transfer of a farm allotment under this provision would not reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm surrendering the acreage unless no cotton was planted on such farm for three consecutive years. It is also provided that the transferred acreage shall not operate to increase allotments for any subsequent year for the farm receiving such transferred acreage. The bill also provides that farm acreage allotments may be permanently released in writing to the county committee and reapportioned as provided in the bill.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

SEC. 342. Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the number of bales of cotton (standard bales of five hundred pounds gross weight) adequate, together with (1) the estimated carryover at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year, to make available a normal supply of cotton. The national marketing quota for any year shall be not less than ten million bales or one million bales less than the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of cotton for the marketing year ending in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed, whichever is smaller: *Provided*, That the national marketing quota for [1950] 1954 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment of [twenty-one] *twenty-two and one-half* million acres. Such proclamation shall be made not later than October 15 of the calendar year in which such determination is made.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 344.

* * * * *

(b) The national acreage allotment for cotton for 1953 and subsequent years shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period [.] *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no State acreage allotment for 1954 shall be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952 by more than 29½ per centum and the additional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. The provisions of this subsection relating to 1954 only shall not apply in the establishment of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for extra long staple cotton under Section 347 of this Act.

* * * * *

(c) The State acreage allotment for cotton shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions (*except those relating only to 1954*) as is applicable to the State under subsections (b), (e), and (d) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of its State acreage allotment (15 per centum if the State's 1948 planted acreage was in excess of one million acres and less than half its 1943 allotment) which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms[.], or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(f) The county acreage allotment, less not to exceed the percentage provided for in paragraph 3 of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which

cotton has been planted (or regarded as having been planted under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined on the following basis:

(1) There shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) five acres; or (B) the highest number of acres planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton in any year of such three-year period.

(2) The remainder shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment to such farm under paragraph (1) (A) shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county or administrative area) of the acreage, during the preceding year, on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, excluding from such acreages the acres devoted to the production of sugarcane for sugar; sugar beets for sugar; wheat, tobacco, or rice for market; peanuts picked and threshed; wheat or rice for feeding to livestock for market; or lands determined to be devoted primarily to orchards or vineyards, and non-irrigated lands in irrigated areas: *Provided, however, That if a farm would be allotted under this paragraph an acreage together with the amount of the allotment to such farm under paragraph (1) (A) in excess of the largest acreage planted (and regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton during any of the preceding three years, the acreage allotment for such farm shall not exceed such largest acreage so planted (and regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) in any such year.*

(3) The county committee may reserve not in excess of 15 per centum of the county allotment (15 per centum if the States' 1948 planted cotton acreage was in excess of one million acres and less than half its 1943 allotment) which, in addition to the acreage made available under the proviso in subsection (e), shall be used for (A) establishing allotments for farms on which cotton was not planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) during any of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made, on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton; and (B) making adjustments of the farm acreage allotments established under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in this paragraph and abnormal conditions of production on such farms[**1**], *or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship: Provided, That not less than 20 per centum of the acreage reserved under this subsection shall, to the extent required, be allotted, upon such basis as the Secretary deems fair and reasonable to farms (other than farms to which an allotment has been made under subsection (f) (1) (B)), if any, to which an allotment of not exceeding fifteen acres may be made under other provisions of this subsection.*

* * * * * *

(6) *Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such three year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).*

(7) *For 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this section on which cotton will not be produced and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other*

physical factors affecting the production of cotton. Any transfer of allotments under this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an allotment for failure to produce cotton during a three-year period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which the acreage is transferred: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein.

(

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6665

[Report No. 1058]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 30, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 31, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

5 (a) By striking out "1950" and inserting in lieu thereof
6 "1954".

7 (b) By striking out the word "twenty-one" and insert-
8 ing in lieu thereof "~~22~~²¹₂" "*twenty-two and one-half*".

9 SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
10 of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

1 (a) By striking out the period at the end of subsec-
2 tion (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and adding
3 the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other
4 provision of this Act, no State acreage allotment for 1954
5 shall be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in the
6 State in 1952 by more than $29\frac{1}{2}$ per centum and the addi-
7 tional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national
8 acreage allotment and the production from such acreage
9 shall be in addition to the national marketing quota,~~and in~~
10 ~~establishing future State acreage allotments the total acre-~~
11 ~~age planted in any State in excess of the acreage that would~~
12 ~~have been allotted except for this proviso shall not be counted.~~
13 The provisions of this subsection relating to 1954 only shall
14 not apply in the establishment of acreage allotments and
15 marketing quotas for extra long staple cotton under sec-
16 tion 347 of this Act."

17 (b) By changing subsection (e) by inserting after the
18 words "and conditions" the language "(except those relat-
19 ing only to 1954)" and by striking the period at the end of
20 such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and
21 adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to
22 prevent hardship."

23 (c) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon
24 before the word "*Provided*" and inserting in lieu thereof
25 a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acre-

1 age allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hard-
2 ship:”.

3 (b) By adding two new paragraphs “(6)” and “(7)”
4 at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

5 “(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1)
6 and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recom-
7 mends such action and the Secretary determines that such
8 action will facilitate the effective administration of the Act
9 and result in a more equitable distribution of the county
10 allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage
11 allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3)
12 of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which
13 cotton has been planted in any one of the three years im-
14 mediately preceding the year for which such allotment is
15 determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on
16 the farm during such three-year period. If the county acre-
17 age allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county
18 in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acre-
19 age reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be
20 used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which
21 are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under
22 this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in
23 paragraph (3).

24 “(7) For 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage
25 allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this sec-

1 tion on which cotton will not be produced and which is
2 voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be
3 deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be
4 reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in
5 the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined
6 by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on
7 the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equip-
8 ment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation
9 practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the
10 production of cotton. Any transfer of allotments under
11 this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for
12 any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is
13 transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an
14 allotment for failure to produce cotton during a three-year
15 period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase
16 the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which
17 the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That notwithstanding
18 any other provisions of this Act, any part of any farm acre-
19 age allotment may be permanently released in writing to the
20 county committee by the owner and operator of the farm,
21 and reapportioned as provided herein."

83^d CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 6665

[Report No. 1058]

A BILL

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

By Mr. HOPE

JULY 30, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 31, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

consideration of the bill (S. 285) to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

Research and experimentation in the field of weather modification and control have attained the stage at which the application of scientific advances in this field appears to be practical.

The effect of the use of measures for the control of weather phenomena upon the social, economic, and political structures of today, and upon national security, cannot now be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that modification and control of weather, if effective on a large scale, would cause profound changes in our present way of life and would result in vast and far-reaching benefits to agriculture, industry, commerce, and the general welfare and common defense.

While the ultimate extent to which weather modification and control may be utilized is speculative, the application of such measures without proper safeguards, sufficient data and accurate information may result in inadequate or excessive precipitation; may cause catastrophic droughts, storms, floods, and other phenomena with consequent loss of life and property, injury to navigable streams and other channels of interstate and foreign commerce, injury to water supplies for municipal, irrigation, and industrial purposes, and injury to sources of hydroelectric power; may otherwise impede the production and transportation of goods and services for domestic consumption and export and for the national defense; and may otherwise adversely affect the general welfare and common defense.

Through experimentation and full-scale operations in weather modification and control will of necessity affect areas extending across State and possibly across national boundaries. The Congress, therefore recognizes that experimentation and application of such measures are matters of national and international concern.

Accordingly, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, in order to effect the maximum benefit which may result from experiments and operations designed to modify and control weather, to correlate and evaluate the information derived from such activity and to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof with respect to such activity, all to the end of encouraging the intelligent experimentation and the beneficial development of weather modification and control, preventing its harmful and indiscriminate exercise, and fostering sound economic conditions in the public interest.

CREATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a national committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Weather Control (hereinafter called the "Committee").

SEC. 3. The Committee shall make a complete study and evaluation of public and private experiments in weather control for the purpose of determining the extent to which the United States should experiment with, engage in, or regulate activities designed to control weather conditions.

SEC. 4. The Committee shall be composed of the Secretary of Defense or his designee, the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee,

the Secretary of Commerce or his designee, the Secretary of the Interior or his designee, and five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons in private life of outstanding ability in the fields of science, agriculture, and business. A vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner that the original appointment was made.

SEC. 5. The Committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, the chairman to be elected from among those appointed from private life.

SEC. 6. The Committee shall meet semi-annually on the first Monday in April and the first Monday in October, and, on due notice, at such other times as the committee may determine. Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 7. The members of the committee who are in the executive branch of the Government shall receive no additional compensation for their services on the Committee. The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Committee. All members of the Committee shall be reimbursed in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Committee.

SEC. 8. The Committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Committee, including one executive secretary at a salary not exceeding \$11,000 per annum. Officers and employees other than the executive secretary shall be appointed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that to the extent the Committee deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel for positions requiring scientific or special qualifications may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. The Committee shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee.

SEC. 9. (a) The Committee, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Committee shall deem advisable. Any member of the Committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Committee or before such member.

(b) The Committee is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics, for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Committee, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) The Committee may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the personnel of any other agency of the Federal Government.

(d) (1) The Committee shall be entitled by regulation, subpoena, or otherwise, to obtain such information from, require such reports and the keeping of such records by, and make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises or property of, any person as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, but this authority shall not be exercised if adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal agency. In

case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena served upon, any person referred to in this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Committee, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(2) The production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person usually keeps them, if, prior to the return date specified in the regulations, subpoena, or other document issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the Committee with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into a stipulation with the Committee as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(3) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited or willfully fails to perform any act required by the above provisions of this subsection, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$500 for each offense.

(4) Information obtained under this act which the Committee deems confidential for purposes of national security or other reasons or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person or agency furnishing such information, shall not be published or disclosed unless the Committee determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the purposes of this act, and any member or employee of the Committee willfully violating this provision shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$5,000.

(e) The Committee shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the other executive agencies of the Government.

SEC. 10. (a) The Committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Congress from time to time. Particularly it shall report, at the earliest possible moment, on the advisability of the Federal Government regulating, by means of licenses or otherwise, those who attempt to engage in activities designed to modify or control the weather. The Committee shall make a final report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1956.

(b) Thirty days after the submission to the Congress of such final report, the Committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 1, after the word "designee", insert: "the Director of the National Science Foundation or his designee, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his designee."

Page 4, strike out lines 10, 11, and 12, and insert the following:

"Sec. 5. The President shall appoint the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman shall be appointed from among those persons appointed to the Committee from private life."

Page 4, strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 21 and insert:

"Sec. 6. The Committee shall hold at least two meetings a year, approximately 6 months

apart, and, on due notice, shall meet at such other times as the Committee may determine. Six members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "\$11,000" and insert: "\$12,000."

Page 8, strike out lines 21 to 25 and on page 9 lines 1 to 5 and insert the following:

"SEC. 10. (a) The Committee shall from time to time submit a report on its findings and recommendations to the President for submission to the Congress. At the earliest possible moment, the Committee shall submit a report to the President for submission to the Congress on the advisability of the Federal Government regulating, by means of licenses or otherwise, those who attempt to engage in activities designed to modify or control the weather. The Committee shall submit a final report to the President for submission to the Congress not later than June 30, 1956.

"(b) Thirty days after the Committee has submitted such final report to the President, the Committee shall cease to exist."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6549) to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill all about?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that will authorize the Federal Government to proceed with a contract with the city of St. Louis for a memorial at St. Louis, Mo., but without expense to the Government at this time. This bill will not cost the Government anything unless later on appropriations are made. There is an agreement in the report that at no time will the friends of this memorial make a request for an appropriation until the Federal budget is in balance.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the estimated future appropriation?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The estimated future appropriations might run to four or five million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Iowa think the budget ever will be in balance?

Mr. LECOMPTE. This bill will not cost the Government a cent until the budget is in balance. If the passage of this bill results in a balanced budget at an early date the bill is truly a gift from heaven.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be constructed by the Secretary of the Interior upon the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site, St. Louis, Mo., an appropriate national memorial to those persons who made possible the territorial expansion of the United States, including President Thomas Jefferson and his aides, Livingston, and Monroe, who negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, the great explorers, Lewis and Clark, and the hardy hunters, trappers, frontiersmen, pioneers, and others who contributed to such expansion.

SEC. 2. (a) The memorial authorized herein shall be constructed in general, in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission on May 25, 1948. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Secretary is also authorized to employ, in his discretion, by contract or otherwise, landscape architects, architects, engineers, sculptors, artists, other expert consultants, or firms, partnerships, or associations thereof, and to include in any such contract provision for the utilization of the services and facilities, and the payment of the travel and other expenses, of their respective organizations, in accordance with the usual customs of the several professions and at the prevailing rates for such services and facilities, without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, the Classification Act of 1949, section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or any other law or regulation relating to either employment or compensation.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, in connection with the construction and operation of the memorial, is authorized to grant such easements as are in the public interest, and, in his discretion, to convey to the city of St. Louis for above-ground parking structures, under such terms and conditions as he may consider to be compatible with maintaining the integrity, appearance, and purposes of said memorial, such portion of the historic site as may in his judgment be excluded therefrom without detriment thereto, subject, however, to reversion of such portion of the historic site to the United States if such excluded area ceases to be used for parking purposes by said city.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to grant easements for the purpose of erecting underground structures suitable for public protection under such terms and conditions as he may consider to be compatible with maintaining the integrity, appearance, and purposes of said memorial.

SEC. 3. The memorial project authorized herein shall not be undertaken until there shall have been reached an agreement satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior providing for the relocation of the railroad tracks and structures now situated on lands adjacent to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site, between the boundary of the site and the river. Such agreement shall contain such terms as may be deemed desirable by the Secretary but shall contain a provision limiting the Federal expenditure of funds in connection with such relocation of the tracks and structures to work undertaken within the historic site area.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$5 million to complete certain elements of the memorial as authorized by this act. These elements are specifically described as (1) railroad relocation, \$1,875,000; (2) grading and filling, \$1,125,000; (3) landscaping, \$500,000; (4) paved areas, utilities, and so forth, \$900,000;

and (5) restoration of Old Courthouse, \$600,000. Funds authorized to be appropriated by this act shall be expended by the United States for construction of the memorial in the ratio of \$3 of Federal funds for each \$1 of money contributed hereafter by the city of St. Louis or other non-Federal source for purposes of the memorial, and for such purposes the Secretary is authorized to accept from the said city or other non-Federal sources, and to utilize for purposes of this act, any money so contributed: *Provided*, That the value of any land hereafter contributed by the city of St. Louis shall be excluded from the computation of the city's share.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton-marketing quotas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out "1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "1954."

(b) By striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-two and one-half."

SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out the period at the end of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no State acreage allotment for 1954 shall be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952 by more than 29½ percent and the additional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. The provisions of this subsection relating to 1954 only shall not apply in the establishment of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for extra long staple cotton under section 347 of this act."

(b) By changing subsection (e) by inserting after the words "and conditions" the language "(except those relating only to 1954)" and by striking the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(c) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon before the word "*Provided*" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship."

(d) By adding two new paragraphs "(6)" and "(7)" at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has

been planted in any 1 of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such 3-year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).

"(7) For 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this section on which cotton will not be produced and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton. Any transfer of allotments under this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an allotment for failure to produce cotton during a 3-year period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, any part of any farm-acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as many Members of the House know, the Committee on Agriculture has for several weeks been attempting to get together on a bill dealing with cotton acreage allotments. It has been a very difficult situation with which to deal because there are many conflicting interests involved. I am happy to say that the committee this morning was able to get together on a bill. Many areas and many interests have been willing to compromise their conflicting views, and I believe we have a bill which is fair to all areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we pass a cotton acreage bill. That is the reason that the committee has devoted so much time and attention to the matter. As far as we can foresee now, it is almost certain that there will be marketing quotas on cotton next year, and if there are marketing quotas, based on the information which we have at the present time, the total acreage allotment will be 17,500,000 acres, and that will require a reduction in acreage below the 1953 acreage of something like 35

percent as a national average and considerably more than that in some States.

For instance, under the existing law the acreage allotment for California next year, on the basis of a 17,500,000-acre national allotment would be 49 percent of the 1953 planted acreage this year, and there would be other States which would suffer severe hardships.

This bill does five things. I will refer to them very briefly. First, it provides that the national acreage allotment for 1954 will be 22,500,000 acres. That is the basic allotment. In the second place it provides that no State will receive an acreage cut of more than 29.5 percent below its 1952 acreage. The acreage required for this purpose will be in addition to the national acreage allotment. In the third place it provides that the State acreage reserves shall be used in addition to other purposes for correcting inequities in farm allotments. That is a very important matter as every Member who comes from a cotton section knows. The next point covered by this bill is that with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture county committees may apportion farm acreage allotments on the basis of previous farm history. The last provision provides that for 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to any farm which is voluntarily surrendered by the operator of that farm may be reallocated to other farms in the county.

That, in brief, Mr. Speaker, is the bill before you. I can say that it was reported by the Committee on Agriculture this morning, not entirely but almost unanimously, and it represents the viewpoint of Members from all parts of the country, including a large number from the Cotton States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What crops are covered under this? Is it limited to wheat and cotton?

Mr. HOPE. It is limited to cotton.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] have just asked me about the matter of making adjustments in our cotton acreage base for unusual weather in connection with the drought in west Texas and Oklahoma during the last 2 years. May I ask the gentleman if it is not correct to say that the representatives of the Department were present, including the Solicitor of the Department, and upon questioning the Solicitor stated that unquestionably the Department had the right under the present law to make those adjustments, that the Department does consider that this drought was the type of unusual weather condition that the law contemplated, that the Department most certainly would make adjustments under the existing law, and therefore there was no need for providing any further provisions in this bill regarding

unusual weather conditions. In other words, he said that the present law is adequate and will be used.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. I think I can say that had the committee not received that assurance we would have given consideration to that particular aspect of the matter in view of severe drought conditions now prevailing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Solicitor informed you that he thought under the present act he had that authority, or is it under this new amendment here?

Mr. HOPE. No, it is under existing law.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. He stated that he had the right, but did he indicate that they would exercise that right?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, as strongly as could be indicated.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not only this year, but from during a period lasting 16 to 40 months a drought has occurred in western Oklahoma. We are in a very peculiar situation, as the gentleman from Kansas knows. I used to live in his district. In his district they do not grow any cotton. In my district, which is 500 miles long and comprises 21,430 square miles, the area is so diversified that in the heart of this district we have to raise cattle, grow either cotton, wheat, or grain sorghums, peanuts, or alfalfa, or a combination of these crops, alternating our crops because of conditions. In such areas farmers are plagued by leafhoppers, grasshoppers, green bugs, and boll weevils, and on top of that they suffer severe droughts, hailstorms, and sandstorms. In that particular area 30 percent of the cotton in my district has not been planted, usually there is more cotton planted in my district than in the balance of the State combined. For many years prior to quotas and acreage allotments our farmers voluntarily reduced the acreage. These droughts and other unusual weather conditions have further greatly reduced our cotton acreage. Many areas are not even planted at all. Will such areas, counties, and individual farms be considered as having been planted, for the purpose of making additional State, county, and farm allotments?

Mr. POAGE. I believe the gentleman will recall that when I asked the specific question if they consider the present drought in Texas and Oklahoma as meeting the requirements of unusual weather conditions he said: "Yes." I asked if they would make an adjustment, and he said "Yes." Of course, he could not tell us exactly what the adjustment would be, for that would depend on the amount of damage that was found.

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] nailed that matter down in the committee, so I do not think there can be any question about it whatever.

May I say in conclusion that it is very important from the standpoint not only

of cotton but of the entire agriculture of this country that this legislation be passed. In the first place, if we do not pass it and permit an increased acreage as far as cotton is concerned, we may find ourselves in the same situation we did after the Korean war broke out, when we had what amounted to a shortage of cotton in this country and by reason of it we had to prohibit exports and thereby lost market outlets, while other countries expanded production. That very fact has contributed materially to the cotton situation that we have today. In the second place, unless we pass this legislation the cut in cotton

acreage will be so severe that it is going to be reflected in increased acreage in other crops, which will further complicate surplus situations in the those crops.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, to concur in the splendid statement made by my friend from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and to emphasize the fact that this legislation is vital to the welfare of the entire Nation. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, many Members from the cotton-growing States have asked me to place in the RECORD a table with respect to the effect of the Hope bill, H. R. 6665, which was an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton-marketing quotas, and was approved by the House today. I incorporate this table as a part of my remarks. Column No. 3 shows the indicated approximate State allotments under the bill H. R. 6665.

Cotton: Apportionment of an assumed national acreage allotment of 22.5 million acres to States with minimum State allotments based on reductions of not more than 29.5 percent of 1952 acreage

State	Acreage in cultivation July 1, 1952	Apportionment of 22.5 million acres on basis of present law ¹	Indicated State allotments with maximum cuts of 29.5 percent of 1952 planted acreage	Indicated allotment as a percent of 1952 planted acreage
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Percent
Alabama.....	1,556.0	1,437.0	1,437.0	92.4
Arizona.....	616.0	368.0	434.3	70.5
Arkansas.....	1,910.0	1,943.0	1,943.0	101.7
California.....	1,405.8	893.0	991.1	70.5
Florida.....	55.0	43.0	43.0	78.2
Georgia.....	1,439.0	1,275.0	1,275.0	88.6
Illinois.....	2.6	4.1	4.1	157.7
Kansas.....		0.1	0.1	
Kentucky.....	10.3	11.2	11.2	108.7
Louisiana.....	899.0	816.0	816.0	90.8
Mississippi.....	2,399.0	2,244.0	2,244.0	93.5
Missouri.....	495.0	485.0	485.0	98.0
Nevada.....	1.8	1.0	1.3	72.2
New Mexico.....	288.0	215.0	215.0	74.7
North Carolina.....	753.0	666.0	666.0	88.4
Oklahoma.....	1,283.0	1,171.0	1,171.0	91.3
South Carolina.....	1,109.0	996.0	996.0	89.8
Tennessee.....	841.0	729.0	729.0	86.7
Texas.....	11,719.0	9,180.1	9,180.1	78.3
Virginia.....	26.0	22.5	22.5	86.5
United States.....	26,808.5	22,500.0	22,664.7	84.5

¹ Subject to changes in 1950 basic acreage data because of provisions of Public Law 471, 81st Cong. and Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

Source: Prepared in the Production Programs Division of the Cotton Branch PMA.

Mr. Speaker, many proposals were considered in the long discussions that ultimately produced a bill that the House Agriculture Committee presented to the House as a compromise between the interests of the producers of the old Cotton Belt in the South and the newer producing areas to the West. The RECORD should show some of these proposals.

Congress already had provided a law, in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, for allotting cotton acreage when that became necessary to bring production into line with consumption. However, because of greatly increased plantings of cotton in the West during the last 3 years, that area felt it should have a larger share of the acreage, in 1954 allotments, than was provided in the law governing these allotments. This law stipulates that the acreage should be apportioned among the States on the basis of their average production for the five preceding years, 1947-48-50-51-52.

A proposal was made that the acreage in 1954 be allotted on the basis of acreage planted in the three most immediate years, 1951-52-53, and that no State should have an acreage cut of more than 25 percent below 1952 acreage. This would have moved larger allotments to the West.

Here are two sets of tables showing law, assuming national allotments of 17,500,000 acres or 22,500,000 acres: how such a 3-year proposal would have worked, as compared with the present

Cotton: Apportionment of an assumed national allotment of 17.5 million acres to States on basis of present law and estimated 1951-53 average acreage with minimum State allotment of 75 percent of 1952 acreage

State	Acreage in cultivation, July 1, 1952	State distribution		Percent of 1952 acreage		75 percent of 1952 acreage
		Present law ²	3 year, 1951-53 ¹	Present law	3 year, 1951-53	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Percent	Percent	Thousand acres
Alabama.....	1,556	1,118	982	72	63	1,167
Arizona.....	616	286	376	46	61	462
Arkansas.....	1,910	1,511	1,293	79	68	1,433
California.....	1,405.8	695	888	49	63	1,055
Florida.....	55	33.4	37.1	60	67	41
Georgia.....	1,439	992	922	69	64	1,079
Illinois.....	2.6	3.2	1.9	123	73	2
Kentucky.....	10.3	8.7	7.2	84	70	7.7
Louisiana.....	899	635	589	71	66	674
Mississippi.....	2,399	1,745	1,556	73	65	1,799
Missouri.....	495	377	340	76	69	371
Nevada.....	1.8	0.8	1	44	56	1.4
New Mexico.....	288	167	191	58	66	216
North Carolina.....	753	518	475	69	63	565
Oklahoma.....	1,283	911	885	71	69	962
South Carolina.....	1,109	775	706	70	64	832
Tennessee.....	841	567	533	67	63	631
Texas.....	11,719	7,140	7,701	61	66	8,789
Virginia.....	26	17.5	15.2	69	58	19.5
United States.....	26,808.5	17,500	17,500	65.3	65.3	20,106.6

¹ 1952 acreage assumed for 1953.

² Subject to changes in 1950 basic acreage data because of provisions of Public Law 471, 81st Cong.

Cotton: Apportionment of an assumed national allotment of 22.5 million acres to States on basis of present law and estimated 1951-53 average acreage with minimum State allotment of 75 percent of 1952 acreage

State	Acreage in cultivation July 1, 1952	State distribution		Percent of 1952 acreage		75 percent of 1952 acreage
		Present law ¹	3-year, 1951-53 ²	Present law	3-year, 1951-53	
	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Percent	Percent	Thousand acres
Alabama.....	1,556	1,437	1,263	92	81	1,167
Arizona.....	616	368	483	60	78	462
Arkansas.....	1,910	1,943	1,662	102	87	1,433
California.....	1,405.8	893	1,142	64	81	1,055
Florida.....	55	43	48	78	87	41
Georgia.....	1,439	1,275	1,185	89	82	1,079
Illinois.....	2.6	4.1	2.4	153	92	2.0
Kentucky.....	10.3	11.2	9.3	109	90	7.7
Louisiana.....	899	816	757	91	84	674
Mississippi.....	2,399	2,244	2,001	94	83	1,799
Missouri.....	495	435	437	98	88	371
Nevada.....	1.8	1.0	1.3	56	72	1.4
New Mexico.....	288	215	246	75	85	216
North Carolina.....	753	666	611	88	81	565
Oklahoma.....	1,283	1,171	1,138	91	89	962
South Carolina.....	1,109	996	908	90	82	932
Tennessee.....	841	729	685	87	81	631
Texas.....	11,719	9,180	9,901	78	84	8,789
Virginia.....	26	22.5	19.5	87	75	19.5
United States.....	26,808.5	22,500.0	22,500	83.9	83.9	20,106.6

¹ Subject to changes in 1950 basic acreage data because of provisions of Public Law 471, 81st Cong. and Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

² 1952 acreage assumed for 1953.

The proposal to change the allotments to the States from a 5-year base to 3 years was not acceptable to the old Cotton Belt.

Thereupon the American Farm Bureau Federation came forward with a proposal. This gathered support from the West but was not acceptable to Mem-

bers from the South. The following table shows what the Farm Bureau's national organization proposed:

Illustration of possible acreage allotments for upland cotton with a minimum national allotment of 21.5 million acres plus the acreage necessary for adjustments so that States with more than a 30-percent cut from 1952 will get a minimum allotment of 72½ percent of 1952 and all other States a minimum allotment of 77½ percent

State	1947-52 average acreage in cultivation, July 1 ¹	Assumed allotments for 1954 based on proration of 21.5 million acres	Acreage in cultivation July 1, 1952	Percentage reduction from 1952 planted acreage if minimum national allotment is 21.5 million acres	Allotments that states would get with adjustments	Acres added by adjustments
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	One thousand acres	One thousand acres	One thousand acres	Percent	One thousand acres	One thousand acres
Alabama.....	1,538.5	1,376.8	1,556	11.5	1,376.8	0
Arizona.....	388.9	348.0	616	43.5	446.6	98.6
Arkansas.....	2,074.2	1,856.2	1,910	2.8	1,856.2	0
California.....	951.3	851.3	1,405.8	39.4	1,019.2	167.8
Florida.....	45.8	41.0	55	25.5	42.6	1.6
Georgia.....	1,363.6	1,220.3	1,439	15.2	1,220.3	0
Illinois.....	3.8	3.4	2.6	² (30.8)	3.4	0
Kansas.....	.1	.1			.1	0
Kentucky.....	12.2	10.9	10.3	² (5.8)	10.9	0
Louisiana.....	868.0	776.8	899	13.6	776.8	0
Mississippi.....	2,388.7	2,137.6	2,399	10.9	2,137.6	0
Missouri.....	526.6	471.3	495	4.8	471.3	0
Nevada.....	.7	.6	1.8	66.7	1.3	.7
New Mexico.....	230.0	205.8	288	28.5	223.2	17.4
North Carolina.....	718.8	643.2	753	14.6	643.2	0
Oklahoma.....	1,253.8	1,122.0	1,283	12.5	1,122.0	0
South Carolina.....	1,064.1	952.3	1,109	14.1	952.3	0
Tennessee.....	783.6	701.2	841	16.6	701.2	0
Texas.....	9,783.0	8,759.3	11,719	25.3	9,082.2	322.9
Virginia.....	24.5	21.9	26	15.8	21.9	0
United States.....	24,025.2	21,500.0	26,808.5		22,109.1	609.1

¹ Excludes 1949. Public Law 28 of the 81st Cong. requires that acreage allotments be computed without regard to 1949. Acreage for 1947 includes total war crop credits.

² Parentheses indicate an increase from 1952 planted acres rather than a reduction.

A counterproposal was supported by some southerners, proposing a 22,500,000 national allotment, plus such acreage as would be required to assure that States facing cuts of more than 30 per-

cent of their 1951-52 average production could be cut by no more than 30 percent, and no other State could be reduced by more than 25 percent. A table setting forth this proposal follows:

State	1947-52 average in cultivation July 1	1951 acreage in cultivation July 1	1952 acreage in cultivation July 1	1951-52 average	1947-52 average present law	Average 1951-52 acreage present law with 30-25 min- imum based on 22,500.0	Net gain from gadge
Alabama.....	1,538.5	1,469.0	1,556.0	1,512.5	1,437.0		
Arizona.....	388.9	524.0	616.0	570.0	368.0	399.0	31.0
Arkansas.....	2,074.2	2,211.0	1,910.0	2,060.5	1,943.0		
California.....	951.3	1,330.6	1,405.8	1,368.2	893.0	957.7	64.7
Florida.....	45.8	63.0	55.0	59.0	43.0		
Georgia.....	1,363.6	1,424.0	1,439.0	1,431.5	1,275.0		
Illinois.....	3.8	3.9	2.6	3.2	4.1		
Kansas.....	1				.1		
Kentucky.....	12.2	13.1	10.3	11.7	11.2		
Louisiana.....	868.0	949.0	899.0	924.0	816.0		
Mississippi.....	2,388.7	2,463.0	2,399.0	2,431.0	2,244.0		
Missouri.....	526.6	597.0	495.0	546.0	485.0		
Nevada.....	.7	1.3	1.8	1.6	1.0	1.1	.1
New Mexico.....	230.0	313.0	288.0	300.5	215.0	225.0	10.0
North Carolina.....	718.8	711.0	753.0	732.0	666.0		
Oklahoma.....	1,253.8	1,561.0	1,283.0	1,422.0	1,171.0		
South Carolina.....	1,064.1	1,075.0	1,109.0	1,092.0	996.0		
Tennessee.....	783.6	805.0	841.0	823.0	729.0		
Texas.....	9,788.0	12,488.0	11,719.0	12,103.5	9,180.2		
Virginia.....	24.5	19.0	26.0	22.5	22.5		
United States.....	24,025.2	28,020.9	26,808.5	27,414.7	22,500.0	22,605.8	105.8

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6665, which relates to cotton-marketing quotas carries with it many provisions which are very important to the entire cotton belt. When farmers last produced cotton under allotments many hardships were suffered as a result of the manner in which the allotments were made. It was the opinion of the committee and still is that the law under which we operated in 1950 was a good law, and that had it been administered in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Congress no difficulties would have resulted. Nevertheless, hardships did follow. And, the Congress subsequently enacted legislation to eliminate the hardships.

The bill, H. R. 6665, brings forward the hardship provisions which appeared in the so-called hardship law of 1950. In fact, the pending bill is much broader than the 1950 act. In our judgment it gives to the State and county committees ample discretion in the use of reserves to take care of all hardship cases.

The present law provides that farm allotments be made in each county on the basis of the crop land factor. I shall not attempt to explain what this means because it is well known to everyone, particularly those who live in the cotton belt. This system of allocating acreage was found to be quite suitable in sections of the belt where very high percentages of the crop land are planted to cotton; on the other hand, it proved to be quite unsatisfactory in other sections where low percentages of the land are planted to cotton and where occasionally was found a farm here and there of which a high percentage was planted to cotton. The law resulted in this particular type of farm suffering unreasonable cuts. Great hardships were not only visited upon the farmer but on his tenants as well.

In order to alleviate this particular situation the committee has incorpo-

rated in this bill, in subsection (d) to be exact, language which will permit the county committee by and with the consent of the secretary to allocate acreage within the county on a historical basis. This particular method of making allotments is generally approved of and eagerly sought by farmers residing in many of the low planting sections of the belt. It should prove to be most helpful when and if cotton allotments are again invoked.

Another important provision of the bill appears in subsection (7) of section 2. It authorizes the reallocation of unused acreage in the county for the years 1954 and 1955. This particular proposal was written into the hardship law of 1950 but was made applicable only to that year. It was the feeling of our committee that it should be made available again during the next 2 years.

We have been advised by the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture that the Secretary, because of the present crop situation and the slow disappearance of cotton, could hardly make a national allotment for 1954 larger than the minimum now authorized by law. The minimum they say is only 17½ million acres. Such an allotment would be disastrous. It would, in my judgment, positively destroy the economy of the Cotton Belt. It would wreck and bankrupt thousands of farmers and the Nation as a whole would suffer. We saw the need and so did the officials of the Department to enlarge the minimum for 1954. After carefully considering all factors it has been agreed by everyone that the minimum should be 22½ million acres. The bill so authorizes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the most controversial issue which appeared during our long and serious deliberations was the quantity of acreage which should be allotted to the western end of the Cotton Belt. The westerners appeared and offered a proposal that they be cut not

less than 25 percent of the acreage which they planted to cotton in 1952. This met with vigorous opposition and objection from southern and southeastern Members. The Board of the American Farm Bureau Federation met in Chicago a few weeks ago and recommended that the western producers not be cut more than 27½ percent of their 1952 plantings. Since there was very little difference in the demands of western producers and the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation, westerners immediately accepted and have vigorously promoted the bureau plan. It was just as objectionable to southern and southeastern growers as was the plan originally advanced by the western producers. Between the two there was very little difference.

We have argued and debated this issue for weeks and weeks. There was some giving from both sides but little from the westerners. A stalemate followed. Finally my committee, without my vote or my consent, but by a very large majority, voted for and adopted an amendment providing that no State should be cut less than 29½ percent. This was accepted by the western growers, their spokesmen and, as I have said, by a vast majority of my committee. With due deference to everyone and particularly the members of my committee, for whom I have the greatest respect, I do not feel that this special gadget in behalf of the western growers is fair to the cottongrowers of the South. It rewards the overproducer and penalizes the modest producer—the man who has tried to avoid a surplus by keeping production in line with demand. However, I realize that this is a matter on which my committee has worked its will. It is something on which the House should and will work its will. I do not favor this western gadget. I never have and I never will.

As for the remainder of the bill, it has my support. There were other provisions which I hoped would be incorporated. The majority of the committee felt otherwise. Under the present parliamentary situation amendments are not in order. So, it is this bill or nothing.

In any event, with good administration of the act and with an earnest effort on the part of everyone to do his best, I believe that, if quotas are invoked in 1954, the least possible inconvenience will be visited upon our cottongrowers. This, indeed, is my wish and hope.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has given me to make these remarks. I cannot allow this bill to pass without protesting against the amendment accepted this morning which would allow the bonus acreage given to the Western States to be made part of their acreage history. I think passage of this amendment is more than a compromise—it is an outright concession for which there can be no reasonable or fair justification.

Those of us from the historic Southern Cotton Belt have been aware of the reduction in acreage that we would have to accept because of the provision of the

law under which we have been living for 4 years. We have asked for no special treatment. Even though we have had no special favors, we have agreed in the present bill, because of circumstances beyond our control, to grant special help to the new cotton areas in the West in the interest of harmony throughout the Cotton Belt. We reluctantly agreed to accept bonus acres to the West for 1954 in this bill, but I cannot accept the idea of providing the acreage on a permanent basis.

Because of this giveaway involved here, I question the wisdom of the bill. I am sorry that this bill is being considered under a rule which makes amendments impossible. I realize the majority members would defeat an amendment to make this bonus acreage temporary, but I would certainly like a chance to fight for such a change in the bill.

The people of my district, where approximately 1 million acres of the current crop is planted, have vigorously fought against the western acreage raid. We have been successful in our main effort to prevent a change from 5 to 3 years in the acreage allotment period, but there are many features of the bill before us now which will have a long-range effect which will be detrimental to the best interests of southern cotton farmers.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in H. R. 6665. Our southern Congressmen on the Committee on Agriculture have made a gallant fight against the raiding of the acreage of our southern farmers for the benefit of Arizona and California. They have made a magnificent fight and have brought out a bill which I am sure is the very best that they can get under the circumstances. It will assure for 1 year at least that the farmers of the southeast will not have a very big cut in their acreage allotment. But the thing I am afraid of is that, in effect, it gives to the States of Arizona and California acreage that should be distributed to the farmers of the southeast. I believe this bill serves only the short term interest of the farmers of the southeast and especially the farmers of Georgia. In the long run, my opinion is that it will work against the farmers of the southeast and in favor of the farmers of Arizona and California. It has pained me to see that the American Farm Bureau Federation has lined up with the farmers of the far west against our southern farmers. The head of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, however, has fought valiantly for the farmers of Georgia and the entire South. Mr. Wingate has been untiring in his efforts to save cotton acreage for our farmers. I am just sorry that the American Farm Bureau Federation has taken an antagonistic position toward the agricultural interests of the South.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a rather embarrassing position, in that I feel I have been forced to make concessions beyond any reasonable expectation in order to bring from the Committee on Agriculture legislation which will in a measure give relief that is most necessary if some of the farmers in my section are to continue in the production of a crop on which their economy if not their very livelihood is based.

Some reference has been made here to a compromise, but I cannot subscribe to any such definition of the action which was taken either in or out of the committee which has been wrestling with this problem for weeks.

Unfortunately, and the record and the facts will bear this out, the production of cotton in the irrigated sections of the West is largely concentrated in the hands of producers who are not compelled to rely on cotton for their livelihood. In many instances, as has been admitted before our committee, the production of cotton is merely a sideline with some professional and business men, including oil mills and other processors, who carry on a mechanized operation with a minimum number of human beings involved.

That the declaration of marketing quotas and acreage allotments of approximately 17½ million acres for 1953 would bring about great hardships throughout the cotton belt, is denied by no one. Practically every farm organization has recommended a minimum national acreage allotment for cotton of not less than 22½ million acres if this Nation is to maintain its position on the world cotton market, and if great suffering is not to result throughout the cotton belt. To even contemplate the planting of a cotton crop of 17½ million acres suggests an impact which is far too great for any section to bear.

For this reason, representatives from all of the cotton producing areas met in Washington, as well as in other sections of the country, on numerous occasions during the past several weeks in a genuine effort to reach an agreement on some kind of legislation which would give the relief needed.

Let us look at the picture of what would happen if no changes are made in the present law, and if no authority is given to increase the minimum national allotment above 17½ million acres. The table below shows, first, the acreage in cultivation in each State on July 1, 1952; second, the State distribution under the present law; and third, the percentage cut under the 1952 planting which each State will be forced to accept if no legislation is passed, and cotton farmers vote to operate under quotas and a price support system in 1953:

State	Acres in cultivation July 1952	Distribution for 1953 under present law	Percent of 1952 plantings under present law
Alabama.....	1,556,000	1,118,000	72
Arizona.....	616,000	286,000	46
Arkansas.....	1,910,000	1,511,000	79
California.....	1,405,800	695,000	49
Florida.....	55,000	33,400	60
Georgia.....	1,439,000	992,000	69
Illinois.....	2,600	3,200	123
Kentucky.....	10,300	8,700	84
Louisiana.....	899,000	635,000	71
Mississippi.....	2,399,000	1,745,000	73
Missouri.....	495,000	377,000	76
Nevada.....	1,800	800	44
New Mexico.....	288,000	167,000	58
North Carolina.....	753,000	518,000	69
Oklahoma.....	1,283,000	911,000	71
South Carolina.....	1,109,000	775,000	70
Tennessee.....	841,000	567,000	67
Texas.....	11,719,000	7,140,000	61
Virginia.....	26,000	17,500	69
United States..	26,808,500	17,500,000	65.3

Referring to the above table, who apparently needed an increase in the minimum national allotment the most—California which would have planted 49 percent of its 1952 acreage, or Missouri with its 76 percent, or a reduction of 24 percent from its 1952 plantings?

In our committee yesterday agreement was reached on the contents of a bill which was introduced by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who I might add has been most cooperative throughout this whole matter, and who has been most fair in his consideration of our problems.

The bill which is represented in the original print of H. R. 6665, provided for a minimum national acreage allotment of 22½ million acres, and as stated above no one could find any fault with that figure, which is admittedly fair.

Without burdening the RECORD with a lot of figures, and using California for the purpose of illustration, for after all it appears that the pressures and threats, politically and otherwise, are coming chiefly from that section, we find that in the event the national allotment should be increased to 22½ million acres, and with no other change in the law, and without the use of any gadgets, California would receive a total allocation of 893,000 acres for 1954, an increase of 198,000 acres more than would be received under an allotment of 17½ million acres.

Under the bill agreed to by an overwhelming majority of the Committee on Agriculture on yesterday, provision was made that no State should suffer a reduction of more than 29½ percent of the acreage which it planted in 1952. The bill provided "bonus" acres to those States where the normal allocation of 22½ million acres would place that State in the position of having less than 70½ percent of its 1952 planted acres, and under that formula which is still included in this bill, California would receive

991,100 acres, or a "bonus" of 98,000 acres. That was the agreement which was reached yesterday, but quite properly this agreement adopted by the committee, included a provision that the 98,100 bonus acres would not figure in the historical basis for that State.

However, California and Arizona, the two States receiving this "bonus" which was computed in the so-called historical acreage of those States, would get the benefit of these "bonus" acres which could be used to bring their actual planted acres up to the allotted acres for 1954, a situation which could not prevail in any other State. Since it is a matter of record that no State ever plants its entire allotted acres, and all other States in the future would use their actual planted acres as a base, a reduction of anywhere from 5 to 10 percent, California and Arizona would have the benefit of using the figure as shown as allotted acres for 1954.

Because of the concession which had been made by the representatives of States whose cotton crop is produced by small farmers, on yesterday, we were amazed to learn upon the convening of the committee this morning that the representatives of the cotton barons of the West had issued another ultimatum to the effect that unless all of the cotton which they will plant in 1954 under the provisions of this bill including both their regular allotment and the nearly 100,000 "bonus" acres, can be accepted as history, they would be unwilling to consider the adoption of any changes in the present law.

I think it should be brought out at this time that the producers of the west have consistently and continually refused to agree on any changes in the present law, even including those changes which are included in this bill and designed to eliminate inequities and hardships; and have refused to entertain an amendment raising the minimum national allotment unless they could be assured of securing additional "bonus" acres, and even were so bold as to state publicly that it would be to their advantage to accept the reduced figure of 17½ million acres for 1954 in order to create a national shortage which would preclude marketing quotas and acreage allotments for 1955 when they would be left free to bring into production other hundreds of thousands of acres and again create another surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am speaking for thousands of small cotton farmers throughout the Cotton Belt who would agree that they do not like this bill, who would brand it as most unfair, and yet find themselves in the position of being forced to submit to the action of a ruthless, heartless, and, I might add, exceedingly greedy group.

Missouri is just one of many States where a limitation such as would be imposed through a 17½ million acre national allotment would bring about an economic crisis. Missouri is also one of those States which needs some small changes in the present law to help eliminate inequities and hardships, which this bill would do, and that is why I find myself in the position of not opposing

this bill on what would appear to be the closing hours of this session, in the hope that the relief which is needed so badly by the farmers of my district, as well as throughout most of the cotton-producing areas of this Nation, can be granted. Yes, if such a large number of small farmers were not involved, I, too, could take the position that "I can live with the present law if the others can," but that is not the case. It has been a bitter pill to swallow, Mr. Speaker, and even as late as a week ago I did not think I would ever find myself willing to submit to such a deal as this. In fact, I did vote in the committee against the amendment which gave to those States getting the bonus acres the privilege of using those bonus acres in piling up a historical basis, but again I have to say I am not in a position to oppose the bill, and hope that it cannot only be passed here, but also adopted in the other body and become a law.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the provisions of H. R. 6665 and the reasons therefor.

The condition of supply and demand and carryover with respect to lint cotton makes certain that marketing quotas would be imposed for the 1954 crop year under the provisions of the existing quota law. It is indicated that plantings for 1954 would be reduced to approximately 17½ million acres if the law remains unchanged. Such lack of change would severely damage the cotton economy of the West, the Southwest, and Florida, because of the increases in production following 1949 are not adequately reflected in the present 5-year formula. Moreover, such a reduction might result in cotton being in short supply and with a high price to the encouragement of further shifts to the use of synthetic fibers.

It is for these reasons that we in the West, Southwest, and Florida sought a change in the present quota law with two major proposals. We sought to establish a 3-year base, to include the current year, in order that allocations among States would adequately reflect the most recent, and parenthetically the most efficient, pattern of cotton production by area. Further we sought a proviso, for the same reasons, that no State should suffer greater than a 25-percent loss of acreage.

It became apparent that in the short time available we could not secure the passage of such legislation in this Congress and entered upon a course of compromise. We first abandoned the idea of changing the base period, a major concession. We then retreated from the 25-percent minimum figure to the 29½-percent minimum figure contained in this bill. At the same time we have yielded to demands from other areas in the Cotton Belt for a minimum cut in national acreage of a reduced size which seriously creates the possibility of quotas in additional succeeding years. We feel that the floor of 22½ million acres is too high and would prefer a lower figure, but that is a price we are paying for some recognition of what we feel to be an inequity in the present law.

I do not heartily endorse the proposals in the bill we are considering. I do not feel that our production is given adequate recognition. At the same time I do not oppose them because their passage makes certain that cotton farmers in my area in 1954 will experience a lesser dislocation economically than they would in the absence of such proposals in the law. It is impossible to calculate the individual position of each farmer. Certainly large numbers of them in the West and Southwest have made investments in land leveling, irrigation devices and machinery which necessitate access to production of a substantial acreage of a major cash crop. Moreover cotton growers are not the only sufferers from radical reductions in cotton acreage. Irrigated land can be devoted to many crops. In the portion of California which I represent cotton is the only major crop under a support program. The raising of tree fruits and nuts, potatoes and vegetables is likewise a major activity and these crops are in overproduction from the standpoint of the securing of a fair price. The greater the reduction in California cotton acreage, the greater would be the production of these commodities with disastrous effect on existing producers of such commodities.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. There are two or three questions, I think, some of us would like to ask. One, for instance, is with reference to the reserves. What is the provision in this bill with reference to the reserves?

Mr. COOLEY. There is no provision in this bill for reserves. We have liberalized existing laws so as to confer more discretion upon the local committees in adjusting cases of hardship and distress.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, under the present law the 10 percent to the county and the 10 percent to the State remains?

Mr. COOLEY. It is still in the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know that the gentleman and others from my section of the country have made a hard fight trying to maintain the present law insofar as its application to the production of cotton is concerned. On the other hand, from reading the bill, it would appear that in order not to take a reduction in acreage, particularly in this one year in the southeastern region, you are giving this increase in the base to the western or new areas which were put in production by Secretary Brannan last year when he asked for a 16 million bale crop. I might preface that by saying I differed with him then on the ground that there was no market for it. Now, apparently, just to get by for 1 year—and I want to repeat that I know that you and others from my section have fought as hard as it is possible to fight in trying to protect this situation—but I do believe we are giving away this whole fight all for 1 year's satisfaction of not having any particular reduction. Is that not true?

Mr. COOLEY. May I point out to the gentleman that I have been on the Agriculture Committee for more than 18 years. I do not believe that during that entire time any one matter has been given more careful consideration than this very preplexing problem with which we are now dealing. We have labored on our committee day in and day out, and week in and week out, and it was only this morning that we really came the decision, which we are now presenting here in the form of a bill. While I agree with the gentleman that we have given up something, I want to say we did not give up as much as we were urged to give up, and this does represent a definite compromise between the two conflicting interests. Of course, my interest is similar to that of the gentleman from Mississippi. I know that this bill is vital to the welfare of all of America, and the gentleman knows we could not possibly live with only 17½ million acres of cotton. Under these circumstances, when everybody has composed their differences, as far as it is possible for us to compose them, I hope the gentleman will not object to the bill and will join in supporting it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say further under the present law, 17½ million acres is a minimum. The present law permits the Secretary, in case of national need, to increase that amount. Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture, if the situation is as easy to determine as the gentleman intimates, could easily have increased that amount under the basic law as it is now written. That is true, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. When the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and other officials of that Department appeared before our committee they seemed to be in complete agreement and indicated to us that there was a possibility that the national acreage allotment might be lowered to 17½ million acres. We have a right to assume, of course, that the Secretary of Agriculture would comply with both the letter and the spirit of the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. The clear intent and purpose of the law means that the Secretary makes a determination that this is ample to meet the needs, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Otherwise he has the right to increase it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Not only that, but that would be his obligation?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. If we had not gone along with this increase in acreage, if the Secretary is the kind of man that we have reason to hope that he is, and so far as our observation goes, if the national demand was there, even foreign and domestic, certainly he had the right and obligation to increase that amount.

Mr. COOLEY. Again I say that we have a right to expect the Secretary to carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. If we get production beyond that that is intended for our own use and that for foreign markets, then

we will pay for it by having cotton on hand for which there is no market, which will force down the price of the regular production, is that not true?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course.

Mr. WHITTEN. So, if we have more acres in here and cannot sell the cotton from those acres, we lose in the price that we get from the whole crop.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that we provided exactly the same type of relief for the wheat farmers who were in exactly the same situation the cotton farmers are in.

Mr. WHITTEN. You do not have the same transfer situation as between the two.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean by transfer?

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean the acreage to the new production areas that were without the law; you do not have that extension.

Mr. COOLEY. It is exactly the same situation. We knew that the wheat acreage allotment would be drastically cut, so drastically cut that perhaps farmers would be unwilling to accept the allotments and we would have no price support program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not agree with the gentleman's statement concerning the 17½ million acres. I think that is by far too little. I should like to point out that that could be met by the production in the new areas that have come into production of cotton and that have come in with full knowledge of what the law was, knowing that they would be scaled back in the end.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course the Western areas have increased production substantially and this was done by farmers who were fully aware of the law now in force. Those who increased production did so knowing that in the event acreage allotments and marketing quotas became necessary they would be required to reduce acreage as provided by law, but unfortunately there has been a rapid and a substantial increase in production in those Western areas.

Mr. WHITTEN. And they have made money out of that operation.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say again that the gentleman and my colleague from Mississippi and others on this committee worked hard on this matter and I know how hard they worked, to try to carry the viewpoint that our folks have. But it does seem to me, in order to keep from cutting the individual acres of our farmers for 1 year, that we are agreeing in this bill to put the full weight of the shift over to the acreage in the West, and we will have it for every year after this 1 year.

I say that with full knowledge and appreciation of the hard work that the gentleman and others have done.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to criticize and to find fault, but frequently it is difficult for one to be constructive. Greed is an ancient human weakness. It is often difficult for one to be magnanimous and charitable. The

controversy involved in this situation has been very long and bitter. To compose our differences has been very difficult. Only a few hours ago did we reach an agreement. Unfortunately, we were not able to compose all of our differences, but at least we were able to report a bill which will relieve a situation which otherwise might be very distressing. No one is entirely pleased with the measure we are presenting, but I am certain that this bill is the net result of a very laborious effort on the part of those of us who were anxious to compromise and to compose differences, and to reach the best agreement possible. The vote in the committee was overwhelmingly in favor of the bill, and I do not believe that any member of our committee will attempt to obstruct its passage. If this bill is not passed and if it does not ultimately become law, hundreds of thousands of farmers will be unhappy. The purchasing power of cotton farmers will be destroyed, the adjustment program will be lost, and the price-support program will be gone. When you destroy the purchasing power of the cotton farmers of the Nation, all the people of the Nation will suffer, and the impact on our national economy might prove to be devastating. The cotton farmers of America have demonstrated time and again their willingness to cooperate in a nationwide program which contemplates the production of an abundance, and in a program which enables them to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demands. The law itself provides adequate protection for all the people of the Nation because it provides for all of our needs, both domestic and foreign, and for a normal carry-over which might be used in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, no group of men could have worked more earnestly nor more willingly in this great effort to solve the problems involved in this long drawn-out controversy. No group of men in America are more aware of the importance of the problems of agriculture than those with whom I have the honor of serving on the Committee on Agriculture. I want to pay tribute to every one of them. The farmers of America have no better friends than the men who serve on the House Committee on Agriculture. The fight for the cotton farmers of the South has been led by my good friend, TOM ABERNETHY. He has wrestled with this problem for many long weeks. He approached it with a thorough understanding of its great importance. No man in America could have done a better job than TOM ABERNETHY did in trying to protect the interest of the people of his area. He is an able and distinguished and an outstanding Member of this House and all of us are indebted to him for the great work he has done on the Committee on Agriculture. Having done all he could do in the interest of his own constituents and in the interest of the cotton farmers of his State and area, he was wise enough to lay down the sword and to accept the final results, fully conscious of the fact that he had fought a good fight.

By paying this little tribute to my good friend, TOM ABERNETHY, I certainly do not mean to minimize the importance of any other member of our committee, all of whom have worked faithfully in an honest effort to solve a very perplexing problem. Even those who do not live in areas where cotton is grown have performed in magnificent fashion. I cannot close without complimenting and commending the chairman of our great committee, CLIFFORD HOPE, a statesman and a great American, and one of the ablest men with whom I have ever had the pleasure of serving. But for CLIFF HOPE we probably would not have been able to have presented this bill to you now.

If the other body does not approve this bill just as it is written the Members of that other body will have to take the full responsibility for the results that will definitely follow. We have done the best we could do. Both sides have made concessions and I hope this bill will be approved.

If this bill does not become a law before we adjourn then the Secretary of Agriculture will be our only refuge. We must then look to Secretary Benson to do the best he can to relieve the situation which might finally be disastrous. Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture is given great and broad discretion. If he is severe the impact will be great. He can minimize the severity of the shock of exercising good and sound judgment. I hope that it may not be necessary for us to have to appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture. If this bill is enacted into law the cotton farmers of the Nation will know that Members of the Congress have done the very best they could in dealing with this important matter. But if it is not enacted into law, I hope the cotton farmers of America will know the names and addresses of those who are responsible for having prevented its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this House to vote for the pending measure.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6665), as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4305) to authorize additional appropriations for the lower San Joaquin River project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the prosecution of the plan of improvement approved in the act of December 22, 1944, for the lower San Joaquin River and tributaries, including the Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6080) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations made necessary by the Federal highway system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provision of the Federal Road Aid Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and recognizing that the need to bring traffic from the Washington-Baltimore Parkway and to handle such traffic requires the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds not to exceed \$1,500,000 to the District of Columbia for the construction and maintenance in the District of Columbia of highway-railroad grade separation structures at the point in the northeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of South Dakota Avenue NE., where the proposed extension of New York Avenue as shown on the highway plan of the District of Columbia will cross the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad. Such sums as are appropriated shall remain available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for construction, maintenance, and expenses incident to construction and maintenance, including planning, design, overhead, and supervision.

SEC. 3. Since the construction of New York Avenue extended is primarily for the benefit of motor traffic and to provide connections between the District of Columbia and the Federal highway system, the entire cost of the construction and maintenance of the grade-separation structure referred to in the preceding sections of this act shall be borne by the District of Columbia and no contribution to such cost of construction and maintenance shall be required of any railroad whose right-of-way is crossed by such structure, except as provided in section 4 of this act. The grade-separation structure for which appropriation is hereby authorized shall be designated, constructed, and maintained so as not to interfere with the safe and efficient operation of any railroad whose right-of-way is crossed by the structure.

SEC. 4. When the District of Columbia has acquired, by purchase, condemnation, dedication, gift, or any other means, the right to use as a public thoroughfare the portions of New York Avenue extended adjoining the right-of-way of a railroad company, such railroad company shall dedicate as a public thoroughfare the portion of such street which lies within the right-of-way belonging to such railroad company: *Provided*, That such dedication by the railroad shall not impair or affect the right of the railroad to use for railroad purposes the portion of its right-of-way so dedicated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA MARGARITA RIVER, CALIF.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5731) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas on the average approximately 28,000 acre-feet of water annually in the Santa Margarita River, Calif., runs uncontrolled, unused, and unappropriated and wasted to the sea; and

Whereas this waste of water occurs in an area where water is urgently needed for agriculture and domestic use and use of water is vital to the national defense because of the location of Camp Pendleton, a United States Navy military establishment; and

Whereas subject to the approval by the State of California of the necessary water allocations it is the intention of Congress to impound the said floodwaters now wasting into the ocean for agricultural and domestic use and use by the military establishment at Camp Pendleton: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation, acting pursuant to Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), as far as those laws are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, to construct, operate, and maintain such facilities as may be required to make available to Fallbrook Public Utility District for irrigation, municipal, and domestic use, 40 percent of the water per annum from the De Luz Reservoir hereinafter described: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall allocate to irrigation, municipal, and domestic use an appropriate share of the cost of the De Luz Dam and Reservoir and shall enter into a contract or contracts with the Fallbrook Public Utility District for the delivery of 40 percent per annum of the water from said reservoir under section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and the general repayment obligation shall be spread in annual installments, which need not be equal, and which may be varied in accordance with the economic conditions, all in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, over a period not exceeding 50 years, exclusive of any development period, which

83RD CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6665

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 1, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

5 (a) By striking out "1950" and inserting in lieu thereof
6 "1954".

7 (b) By striking out the word "twenty-one" and insert-
8 ing in lieu thereof "twenty-two and one-half".

9 SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
10 of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

11 (a) By striking out the period at the end of subsec-

1 tion (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and adding
2 the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other
3 provision of this Act, no State acreage allotment for 1954
4 shall be reduced below the acreage planted to cotton in the
5 State in 1952 by more than $29\frac{1}{2}$ per centum and the addi-
6 tional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national
7 acreage allotment and the production from such acreage
8 shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. The
9 provisions of this subsection relating to 1954 only shall
10 not apply in the establishment of acreage allotments and
11 marketing quotas for extra long staple cotton under sec-
12 tion 347 of this Act."

13 (b) By changing subsection (e) by inserting after the
14 words "and conditions" the language "(except those relat-
15 ing only to 1954)" and by striking the period at the end of
16 such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and
17 adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to
18 prevent hardship."

19 (c) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon
20 before the word "*Provided*" and inserting in lieu thereof
21 a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acre-
22 age allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hard-
23 ship:".

24 (d) By adding two new paragraphs "(6)" and "(7)"
25 at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

1 “(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1)
2 and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recom-
3 mends such action and the Secretary determines that such
4 action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county
5 allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage
6 allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3)
7 of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which
8 cotton has been planted in any one of the three years im-
9 mediately preceding the year for which such allotment is
10 determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on
11 the farm during such three year period. If the county acre-
12 age allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county
13 in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acre-
14 age reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be
15 used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which
16 are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under
17 this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in
18 paragraph (3).

19 “(7) For 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage
20 allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this sec-
21 tion on which cotton will not be produced and which is
22 voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be
23 deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be
24 reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in
25 the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined

1 by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on
2 the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equip-
3 ment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation
4 practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the
5 production of cotton. Any transfer of allotments under
6 this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for
7 any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is
8 transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an
9 allotment for failure to produce cotton during a three-year
10 period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase
11 the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which
12 the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That notwithstanding
13 any other provisions of this Act, any part of any farm acre-
14 age allotment may be permanently released in writing to the
15 county committee by the owner and operator of the farm,
16 and reapportioned as provided herein."

Passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

AUGUST 1, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued January 7, 1954
For actions of January 6, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 1

CONTENTS

Accounting.....24	Foreign aid.....6	Reorganization.....30
Appropriations.....34	Labor, farm.....15	Reports.....6
Beef.....9	Lands, grazing.....3	Research.....6
Cattle industry.....7	Land transfer.....5	St. Lawrence Seaway.....2
CCC.....20	Legislative program..2	Social security.....16
Cotton.....1,7,18	Lobbying.....28	Soil conservation.....6,23,32
Civil Service.....6	Loans, farm.....6,25	Stockpiling.....6
Claims.....6	Missouri Basin.....23	Taxes, income.....27
Disaster relief.....7	Peanut-acreage	TVA.....6
Expenditures.....6	allotments.....4	Textiles.....13
Farm credit.....6	Personnel.....11,18	Trade, foreign.....6
Farm policy.....2,12	Prices, farm.....8	Treaties.....2,31
Flood control.....6,7	Purchasing.....2,17	Veterans' benefits.....25,29
Food.....14,26,33	Reclamation.....10,21	Wheat.....22

HIGHLIGHT: Senate committee agreed to cotton-allotments proposal and will review draft in executive session today.

SENATE

1. COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee agreed to a proposal on cotton-acreage allotments. The "Daily Digest" states the proposal includes "(1) provisions for national cotton-acreage allotments of 21 million acres for the year 1954, plus 157,500 acres to be allocated on a historical basis to the States of California, New Mexico, and Arizona, and 157,500 acres to be allocated, also on a historical basis, to the other States, and (2) provisions that no State's allotment shall be reduced more than 34 percent of its 1952 planted acreage." (p. D1.) The full committee will consider this proposal today (p. D2).
2. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader Know land announced that the President's state-of-the union message will be heard today, and that "on Monday it is expected that the President's message on agriculture and labor will be presented to the two Houses, coming to us by messenger." Beginning Monday, but not necessarily in this order, bills authorizing GSA and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts, restricting the President's treaty power, and creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation will be considered. (p. 2.)

HOUSE

3. GRAZING LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6186, authorizing the Interior Secretary to grant preferences

to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal (H. Rept. 1096) (p. 18).

4. PEANUT-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Received this Department's proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to peanut acreage allotments; to the Agriculture Committee (p. 17).
5. LAND TRANSFER. Received this Department's proposed legislation to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla., formerly acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act; to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 18).
6. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (pp. 6-7, 12-18):
 - Interior's soil survey and land classification of various projects
 - Army Engineers flood-control surveys on several localities pursuant to Pub. Law 153, 83rd Cong.
 - Contracts for research under the Research and Marketing Act
 - Farm Credit Administration's operations (H. Doc. 267)
 - Compromise, etc., of indebtedness to this Department in the amount of \$1,000 or more
 - GSA's and Defense Department's stockpiling activities
 - Export-control activities of the Commerce Department
 - Operations of the Export-Import Bank
 - FOA's operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act
 - GSA contracts negotiated for research and development
 - Civil Service Commission activities
 - Activities of the TVA
 - Judgments rendered by the Court of Claims
 - Receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U. S. Government
 - Mutual Security program operations (H. Doc. 226)
7. CATTLE INDUSTRY; DROUGHT RELIEF; COTTON ALLOTMENTS; FLOOD CONTROL: Received Ariz. Legislature memorials urging Congress to restore confidence in the cattle industry, grant Federal relief to drought areas, and raise the national cotton acreage allotments; and a Utah Legislature memorial urging Congress to authorize the Colo. River storage project (p. 21).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. FARM PRICES. Rep. Younger inserted Geo. H. Wilson's (pres., Calif. Farm Bureau Federation) letter commending Secretary Benson and stating that "a great majority of farmers do have confidence in the integrity of Mr. Benson and in the ability of the administration" (p. A2).
9. BEEF. Rep. Morano inserted Geo. Converse's article in support of producing commercial beef in Conn. (p. A3).
10. RECLAMATION. Rep. Engle inserted two addresses of W. A. Dexheimer's (Commissioner of Reclamation) discussing some of the present and future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in Calif. and Oregon (pp. A25-6, A26-7).
11. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks by Rep. Small on his legislative plans for this session including his bill, H.R. 1418, to amend the Hatch Act to enable government employees to participate in political campaigns (p. A36).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Second session of the Eighty-third Congress convened.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1-4

Bills Introduced: Four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. Res. 167-170.

Pages 2-3

Senators Sworn In: Certificates of appointment were presented and the following two Senators-designate were sworn in as Senators: Robert W. Upton, of New Hampshire, to fill the vacancy created by the death of Senator Tobey, and Thomas A. Burke, of Ohio, to fill the vacancy created by the death of Senator Taft.

Page 2

Procedural Resolutions: The following procedural resolutions were adopted:

Notification to President: S. Res. 167, to appoint two Senators to advise the President that a quorum of the Senate is present and ready to receive any message;

Notification to House: S. Res. 168, advising the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is present and ready to transact business; and

Hour of meeting: S. Res. 169, setting the hour of 12 o'clock meridian as the hour of daily meeting of the Senate unless otherwise ordered.

Page 2

Condolence Resolution: Senate adopted S. Res. 170, expressing sorrow on the death of Chief Justice Vinson.

Pages 3-4

Program for Thursday: Senate adjourned at 12:26 p. m. until noon Thursday, January 7, following which it will meet jointly with the House to hear President Eisenhower deliver his message on the state of the Union. Thereafter, Senate will return to its Chamber and will hold a morning hour.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COTTON

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee met in executive session and instructed a special sub-

committee on cotton-acreage legislation to draft a bill to include (1) provisions for national cotton-acreage allotments of 21 million acres for the year 1954, plus 157,500 acres to be allocated on a historical basis to the States of California, New Mexico, and Arizona, and 157,500 acres to be allocated, also on a historical basis, to the other States, and (2) provisions that no State's allotment shall be reduced more than 34 percent of its 1952 planted acreage. The subcommittee was also instructed to work out other details of the proposed bill for full committee consideration.

In an afternoon session, also executive, this subcommittee met and drafted a bill including the above-listed provisions for national cotton-acreage allotment. The full committee will meet tomorrow for consideration of this proposed legislation.

MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Continuing its hearings which were begun during the recess of Congress, the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee heard testimony with regard to oil from Gov. Robert F. Kennon, of Louisiana, who felt that it was imperative that importers of foreign oil pay a differential which would equalize taxes paid by U. S. companies. Subcommittee also heard Andrew Fletcher, president, St. Joseph Lead Co., St. Joseph, Mo., and also president of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, whose testimony pertained to the lead-mining industry. Mr. Fletcher stated that unless steps are taken to protect lead mines of the U. S., they will soon be out of business due to their inability to compete with the lower rates of foreign lead-mining companies, which are made possible by utilization of cheap labor. Subcommittee recessed subject to call of the Chair.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 91 public bills, H. R. 6863-6953; 100 private bills, H. R. 6954-7053; and 26 resolutions, H. J. Res. 327-338, H. Con. Res. 184-192, and H. Res. 394-398, were introduced. Pages 6-7, 10, 18-23

Bill Reported: One report was filed as follows: H. R. 6186, to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal (H. Rept. 1096). Page 18

Resignation of Member: Heard the reading of letter of resignation of Representative Clifford P. Case, of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey. Page 5

New Members Sworn: Representatives-elect William H. Natcher, of the 2d Congressional District of Kentucky; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of the 6th Congressional District of New Jersey; Glenard P. Lipscomb, of the 24th Congressional District of California; and Lester Johnson, of the 9th Congressional District of Wisconsin, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office. Page 6

Notification of President: Adopted H. Res. 394, authorizing appointment of three Members to join with a committee of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and is ready to receive communications. Representatives Halleck, Reed of New York, and Rayburn were appointed to this committee by the Speaker. Page 6

Notification of Senate: Adopted H. Res. 395, instructing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and ready to proceed with business. Page 6

Hour of Meeting: Adopted H. Res. 396, fixing, unless otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock meridian. Page 6

Joint Committee on Defense Production: Heard the reading of a communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency notifying the Speaker of the resignation of Representative Patman from the Joint Committee on Defense Production and

filling the vacancy with the appointment of Representative Spence. Page 7

Judicial and Congressional Salaries: The Speaker announced the appointment to membership on the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries of the following:

Walter Cenerazzo, president, Watchmakers Union, Waltham, Mass.;

John E. Galvin, chairman of the board, Ohio Steel Foundry Co., Lima, Ohio;

Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, Columbus, Ind.;

Hon. Harry L. Towe, New Jersey;

Hon. Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; and

Hon. Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania. Page 7

Sergeant at Arms: The Speaker announced the temporary appointment of William R. Bonsell to be Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives pending the choosing of a permanent Sergeant at Arms. The resignation of Lyle O. Snader from this position had previously been read and accepted. Page 7

Joint Session: Adopted H. Con. Res. 184, providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Chamber of the House of Representatives Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12:30 p. m., for the purpose of receiving the President's message on the state of the Union. Page 7

Democratic Leader: Representative Rayburn, the minority floor leader, received the felicitations of many Members on his birthday. Pages 7-9

Condolence Resolution: Adopted H. Res. 397, expressing condolence on the death of Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky. Pages 9-12

Adjournment: As a further mark of respect to the memory of Chief Justice Vinson, the House adjourned at 1:18 p. m. until Thursday, January 7, at 12, when it will meet in a joint session with the Senate to hear the President deliver his state of the Union message.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 7

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, to consider a draft of cotton-acreage allotment bill, 10 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Real Estate

and Military Construction, executive, on pending classified projects, 9:30 a. m., room P-38, Capitol.

Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, to hear Secretary Dulles, 3 p. m., room F-53, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on Hawaii statehood, with former Governor of Hawaii Ingram Stainback, 10 a. m., 224 Senate Office Building.

House

No committee meetings were scheduled.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued January 8, 1954

For actions of January 7, 1954

83rd-2nd, No. 2

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....1A,3,6	Farm program.....21,25,36	<i>POTATOES</i> Pesticides.....35	<i>1-A</i>
Adjournment.....14,18	Farm units.....28	President's message.....1	
Appropriations.....4	Flood control.....11	Prices.....8,27	
Banking and Currency...13	Foreign aid.....4,10	Reports.....4	
Claims.....4	Irrigation.....28	Research.....4,15	
Cotton.....1,6,29	Lands, classification...4	Stockpiling.....12	
Dairy industry.....20	grazing.....34	Taxation.....7,31	
Defense production.....16	public.....5	Trade, foreign.....4	
Drought relief.....6	reclamation....17,26	Transportation.....19,30	
Education.....33	transfer.....2,32	Treaties.....7,22	
Electrification.....9	Livestock.....6,8	TVA.....23	
Expenditures.....7,24	Peanuts.....3	Wheat..... <i>1-A</i> 37	
Farm credit.....4	Personnel.....4,31		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses heard President's state-of-the-union message. Senate committee reported cotton-allotments bill including provisions for purchasing Irish potatoes and additional acreage for scarce wheat types.

SENATE

1. PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE. Both Houses received the President's state-of-the-union message (H. Doc. 251) (pp. 26, 67-7). Attached is a statement on the agricultural provisions of his message.
- 1A. COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2643, providing for cotton-acreage allotments for 1954, and Sens. Aiken, Paybank, and Johnson (Tex.) spoke briefly on this bill (S. Rept. 838) (p. 41). The "Daily Digest" states the major provisions of the bill would provide:
 - (1) An increase from 17.9 million to 21 million acres of the national cotton-acreage allotment for 1954 (the increased acreage to be allocated on the basis of history);
 - (2) 315,000 additional acres allocated on a historical basis to the States as follows: 157,500 to California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and 157,500 to 14 other cotton States;
 - (3) An additional 59,389 acres to be allocated in such manner as to provide each State with an acreage allotment equal to 66 percent of its 1952 planted acreage (Arizona would receive 36,499 additional acres and California 22,890 additional acres);
 - (4) An additional 5,000 acres to Florida;
 - (5) That individual farms will be entitled to the larger of either 65 percent of its average cotton acreage of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted in any 1 of these 3 years, but not to

exceed 50 percent of the total cropland;

(6) Voluntary surrender of unplanted acreage of individual farms to be reapportioned by county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable, and if the county cannot use such land, it may return such acreage to the State for reallocation to other counties;

(7) For purchase of Irish potatoes with section 32 funds; and

(8) Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to allot additional acres for special varieties or types of wheat in short supply.

2. LAND TRANSFER. Received from this Department proposed legislation to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla., formerly acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 27).
3. PEANUT-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Received from this Department proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to peanut-acreage allotments; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 27).
4. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (pp. 26-31);
 - Farm Credit Administration's operations
 - Mutual Security program operations
 - Compromise, etc., of indebtedness to this Department in the amount of \$1,000 or more
 - Operations of the Export-Import Bank
 - Export-control activities of the Commerce Department
 - Contracts for research under the Research and Marketing Act
 - Interior's soil survey and land classification of various projects
 - Navy Department's stockpiling activities
 - FOA's worldwide enforcement of strategic trade controls
 - Adjudications and compromise settlements of claims by Justice
 - Activities of the Civil Service Commission's Board of Actuaries
 - Budget Bureau's reapportionment of certain appropriations for CCC and the Forest Service
5. PUBLIC LANDS. Sen. Butler discussed H. R. 1815, providing for the lease by Interior of Alaskan public lands to nonprofit organizations, and his proposed amendments thereto (pp. 41-2).
6. CATTLE INDUSTRY; DROUGHT RELIEF; COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Received Ariz. Legislature memorials urging Congress to restore confidence in the cattle industry, grant Federal relief to drought areas, and raise the national cotton acreage allotments (pp. 31-2).
7. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES; TREATIES. Received Utah Legislature memorials urging Congress to reduce taxes and expenditures, and favoring restricting of the President's treaty power (pp. 33, 34).

Sen. Wiley spoke opposing the Bricker amendment, limiting the President's treaty power, and inserted a newspaper editorial discussing this amendment (pp. 54-5).
8. CATTLE PRICES. Received an Ariz. United Livestock Producers' Assn. resolution "relating to stabilization of prices in the livestock industry" (p. 35).

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF
1938, AS AMENDED

JANUARY 7, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2643]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

GENERAL STATEMENT

On October 9, 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed marketing quotas for the 1954 crop of cotton, the first cotton crop for which quotas have been in effect since the 1950 crop. Under the provisions of the law, the quota was required to be proclaimed at 10 million bales, which provided a national acreage allotment of 17,910,448 acres, more than 7 million acres below the 1953 planted acreage. A reduction of this size in 1 year was recognized by the Secretary at the time of proclaiming the quota as requiring severe adjustments with a heavy impact on the economy of the Cotton Belt. This had been foreseen by your committee, which held hearings in June and July of 1953 on S. 2106 and S. 2183. However, it was not possible to work out suitable adjustments at that time.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for adjustments which will begin the downward adjustment in production which is essential at this time, without causing the unnecessary hardship which would result from making the adjustment in a single year. Somewhat similar action was taken by Congress in 1950 when cotton quotas were last in effect. The bill also contains provisions relating to wheat and Irish potatoes.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill provides for increasing the 1954 national acreage allotment from 17,910,448 acres to 21 million acres, apportionment to the States

being made in the same manner as though the allotment had originally been proclaimed at 21 million acres.

The bill further provides for the allotment of 315,000 additional acres, one-half of which is to be allotted to Arizona, California, and New Mexico on the basis of their respective shares of the national allotment, and the other half to be allotted to the other States (excluding Nevada, Illinois, and Kansas which receive minimum allotments under sec. 344 (k) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938) on the basis of their respective shares of the national allotment.

In addition, the bill provides for the allotment of such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide each State with not less than 66 percent of its 1952 planted cotton acreage.

All of the additional acreage allotted to States under the foregoing provisions of the bill, including the additional acreage resulting from the increase in the national acreage allotment, would be allotted directly to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of its average planted acreage for 1951, 1952, and 1953, or, 40 percent of its highest planted acreage during those years, but not more than 50 percent of its total cropland. If the additional acreage allotted the State is not sufficient to provide the proposed increases in farm allotments in full, all the proposed farm increases would be reduced proportionately. If the additional acreage allotted the State is more than sufficient, the excess would be apportioned to counties to provide further relief in farm allotments.

2 The bill would also permit the surrender and transfer of any part of any 1954 farm allotment to the county committee for reallocation within the county, and if the county committee wished, such released acreage could be transferred to the State committee for reallocation within the State. Such surrendered acreage allotments, if planted, would count in determining farm, State, and county acreage history. It would be counted in the history of the farm from which it was transferred rather than the farm to which it was transferred.

Your committee found that because of production shifts in recent years, it is necessary to provide additional acreage in Florida to prevent hardships which are not fully taken care of by the provisions applicable to the other States. Consequently the bill provides that in addition to the other increases provided by the bill, any State whose total allotment is less than 100,000 acres and more than 30,000 acres shall receive a further allotment equal to 15 percent of the acreage allotted to it prior to enactment of the bill. The increase which Florida would receive under this provision is 4,968 acres.

Section 2 of the bill would permit allotments to farms which are flooded as a result of the construction by the United States of major flood-control reservoirs to be reallocated by the county committee in certain cases. Section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which requires allotments to farms on which cotton has been planted during the 3 previous years, has been interpreted by the Department of Agriculture to require allotment to these farms even though they have been acquired by the Government and are no longer used for farming purposes. Consequently, allotments continue to be made to flooded farms. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act affords some relief to farmers whose farms have been acquired by the Government, but the new allotments provided under subsection (h) are often considered unsatisfactory since they must be comparable to

allotments for other farms in the area in which the new farm is located, and may not be comparable to the farmer's former allotment.

Section 3 of the bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to increase marketing quotas for kinds of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time there is an acute shortage of durum wheat, while production is being unduly restricted by marketing quotas. The law now contains similar provisions for tobacco and peanuts.

Section 4 of the bill would permit section 32 funds to be used in operations with respect to Irish potatoes. Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes" prohibits price support for potatoes. While operations under section 32 do not provide direct price support, they do, by encouraging exports and consumption, have the effect of supporting prices, and section 5 has been held applicable to them. The bill would not remove the general prohibition against price support for potatoes, nor reactivate the mandatory potato price support provision of title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, but would simply permit section 32 operations for potatoes on the same basis as for other perishable commodities.

Set out below is a table showing the manner in which the additional acreage allotments provided by the bill would be apportioned among the States.

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage ¹	1953 acreage in culti- vation, July 1	1954 State acreage allot- ments, 17,910,448	State shares of national allot- ment of 21,000,000 acres ²	State adjust- ments on basis of 5-year average ³		State acreage added by reason of 66- percent pro- vision ⁴	State acreage added by reason of 15- percent pro- vision	Proposed State acreage allot- ments
					157,500	157,500			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama.....	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,708	10,711	-----	-----	-----	1,346,419
Arizona.....	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,963	-----	39,362	36,495	-----	413,820
Arkansas.....	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,368	14,695	-----	-----	-----	1,847,061
California.....	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,606	818,231	-----	95,298	22,879	-----	936,403
Florida.....	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,838	311	-----	-----	4,963	44,117
Georgia.....	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,452	9,458	-----	-----	-----	1,188,910
Illinois.....	2,750	2,400	4,000	4,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	4,000
Kansas.....	35	-----	480	480	-----	-----	-----	-----	480
Kentucky.....	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86	-----	-----	-----	10,799
Louisiana.....	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,476	5,970	-----	-----	-----	750,446
Mississippi.....	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,003,316	16,545	-----	-----	-----	2,079,861
Missouri.....	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,942	3,681	-----	-----	-----	492,623
Nevada.....	1,950	2,000	42,289	42,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	42,000
New Mexico.....	258,000	301,200	167,243	196,105	-----	22,840	-----	-----	218,945
North Carolina.....	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,869	4,971	-----	-----	-----	624,840
Oklahoma.....	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,562	8,736	-----	-----	-----	1,098,293
South Carolina.....	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,653	7,390	-----	-----	-----	929,043
Tennessee.....	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,277	5,415	-----	-----	-----	680,692
Texas.....	12,287,955	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,937	69,361	-----	-----	-----	8,719,293
Virginia.....	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172	-----	-----	-----	21,682
United States.....	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

¹ Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.

² Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in column (3).

³ 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base 1 to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base 1 to the other.

⁴ Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

⁵ Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Prepared by Cotton Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 334. * * *

(e) *Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, whenever after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any kind of wheat that a substantial difference exists in the usage or marketing outlets for any one or more of the kinds of wheat and that the quantity of wheat of such kind or kinds to be produced under the marketing quotas and acreage allotments established pursuant to this title would not be sufficient to provide an adequate supply for estimated market demands and carryover requirements for such kind or kinds of wheat, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for farms producing such kind or kinds of wheat in the preceding year to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such kind or kinds of wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage of such kind or kinds of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and such acreage shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, or farm acreage allotments.*

SEC. 344. * * *

(h) *Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the county committee, upon application by the owner or operator of the farm, (1) may establish an allotment for any cotton farm acquired in 1940 or thereafter for nonfarming purposes by the United States or any State or agency thereof which has been returned to agricultural production but which is not eligible for an allotment under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f) of this section, and (2) shall establish an allotment for any farm within the State owned or operated by the person from whom a cotton farm was acquired in such State in 1940 or thereafter for a governmental or other public purpose: Provided, That no allotment shall be established for any such farm unless application therefor is filed within 3 years after acquisition of such farm by the applicant or within 3 years after the enactment of this Act, whichever period is longer: And provided further, That no person shall be entitled to receive an allotment under both (1) and (2) of this subsection. The allotment so made for any such farm shall compare with the allotments established for other farms in the same area which are similar, taking into consideration the acreage allotment, if any, of the farm so acquired, the land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. Except to the extent that the production on any such farm has contributed to the county and State allotments, any allotment established pursuant to this subsection shall be in addition to the acreage allotments otherwise established for the county and State under this Act, and the production from the additional acreage so allotted shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. In any county, in which a major flood-control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest.*

* * * * *

(m) *Notwithstanding any other provision of law—*

(1) *The national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton shall be increased to 21 million acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A) 315,000 additional acres shall be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New*

Mexico and one-half to the other States (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half being made to the States participating therein on the basis of their respective shares of the increased national acreage allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as may be required to provide each State a total allotment under subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this paragraph (1) shall be apportioned directly to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined, but no farm acreage allotment shall be so increased to an acreage in excess of 50 per centum of the acreage on the farm which in 1953 was tilled or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary but without excluding any acreages as provided by subsection (f) (2) of this section: Provided, That if the State total of the farm increases so computed exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

(2) Any part of any 1954 farm cotton-acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment transferred under this provision and planted shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any 1954 farm-acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned under this paragraph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county in determining future acreage allotments.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than 100,000 acres but more than 30,000 acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 percent of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, AND TO PRICE SUPPORT FOR POTATOES (7 U. S. C., SEC. 1450)

SEC. 5. For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes. Operations with respect to Irish potatoes authorized by section 32

of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c) shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446).

AN ACT TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (7 U. S. C., SEC. 612c)

SEC. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936 an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceeding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations or by other means, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final.

The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 per centum of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year. The sums appropriated under this section shall be devoted principally to perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities [(other than those designated in title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949)] (other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949) and their products. The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over \$300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 712), and section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and seventy-five and for other purposes.



Calendar No. 831

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 2643

[Report No. 838]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 7, 1954

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JANUARY 7, 1954

Reported by Mr. ANDERSON, without amendment

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end
5 thereof the following:

6 “(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

7 “(1) The national acreage allotment established under
8 subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton
9 shall be increased to twenty-one million acres and appor-
10 tioned to the States in the same manner in which the
11 national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954

1 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such in-
2 creased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide
3 equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A)
4 three hundred and fifteen thousand additional acres shall
5 be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona,
6 California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States
7 (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under
8 subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half
9 being made to the States participating therein on the basis
10 of their respective shares of the increased national acreage
11 allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as
12 may be required to provide each State a total allotment under
13 subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this
14 paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage
15 planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The additional
16 acreage made available to States under the provisions of this
17 paragraph (1) shall be apportioned directly to farms so as
18 to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger
19 of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on
20 the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the
21 county committee in establishing allotments under subsection
22 (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage
23 planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years
24 as so determined, but no farm acreage allotment shall be
25 so increased to an acreage in excess of 50 per centum of the

1 acreage on the farm which in 1953 was tilled or in regular
2 rotation, as determined under regulations heretofore pre-
3 scribed by the Secretary but without excluding any acreages
4 as provided by subsection (f) (2) of this section: *Provided*,
5 That if the State total of the farm increases so computed
6 exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State
7 under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced
8 pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State.
9 Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations
10 contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by
11 the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages
12 planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees
13 for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or
14 more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the
15 farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined
16 under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors
17 enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. The pro-
18 visions of this subsection shall not apply to extra long staple
19 cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

20 “(2) Any part of any 1954 farm cotton acreage
21 allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which
22 is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be
23 deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be re-
24 apportioned by the county committee to other farms in the
25 same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by

1 the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis
2 of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available
3 for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and
4 soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of
5 cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered
6 is not needed in the county, the county committee may
7 surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be
8 used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve
9 under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment trans-
10 ferred under this provision and planted shall be regarded
11 for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having
12 been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than
13 on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not
14 operate to make the farm from which the allotment was
15 transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted
16 thereon during the three-year base period: *Provided*, That
17 notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of
18 any 1954 farm acreage allotment may be permanently re-
19 leased in writing to the county committee by the owner
20 and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided
21 herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned under this para-
22 graph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county
23 in determining future acreage allotments.

24 “(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this sec-

tion or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than one hundred thousand acres but more than thirty thousand acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 per centum of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton.”

SEC. 2. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “In any county, in which a major flood control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest.”

1 SEC. 3. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
2 of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end
3 thereof the following:

4 “(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act,
5 whenever after investigation the Secretary determines with
6 respect to any kind of wheat that a substantial difference
7 exists in the usage or marketing outlets for any one or
8 more of the kinds of wheat and that the quantity of wheat
9 of such kind or kinds to be produced under the marketing
10 quotas and acreage allotments established pursuant to this
11 title would not be sufficient to provide an adequate supply
12 for estimated market demands and carry-over requirements
13 for such kind or kinds of wheat, the Secretary shall increase
14 the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for farms pro-
15 ducing such kind or kinds of wheat in the preceding year
16 to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such
17 kind or kinds of wheat adequate to meet such demands and
18 carry-over requirements. The increases in farm marketing
19 quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis
20 of the acreage of such kind or kinds of wheat during the
21 period of years considered in establishing farm marketing
22 quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional
23 acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to
24 the national acreage allotment and such acreage shall not

1 be considered in establishing future State, county, or farm
2 acreage allotments.”

3 SEC. 4. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled
4 “Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage
5 allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Ad-
6 justment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for
7 potatoes” (7 U. S. C. 1450), is amended by inserting at
8 the end thereof the following: “Operations with respect to
9 Irish potatoes authorized by section 32 of the Act entitled
10 ‘An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for
11 other purposes’ (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall not be deemed to
12 be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas
13 are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricul-
14 tural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446).”

15 (b) The parenthetical phrase contained in the sentence
16 preceding the last sentence of section 32 of the Act entitled
17 “An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for
18 other purposes” (7 U. S. C. 612c), is amended to read as
19 follows: “(other than those receiving price support under
20 title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949)”.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

Calendar No. 831

S. 2643

[Report No. 838]

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
1938, as amended.

By Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr.
KUCHEL

JANUARY 7, 1954
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JANUARY 7, 1954

Reported without amendment

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses heard President in joint session.

Senate Agriculture Committee reported cotton acreage bill, and Foreign Relations Committee received report from Secretary Dulles on international situation.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 26-60

Bills Introduced: 42 bills and 6 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2602-S. 2643; S. J. Res. 112; and S. Res. 171-175.

Pages 38-40, 42-43

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Interim report of Committee on Government Operations entitled "State Department—File Survey" (S. Rept. 836);

Interim report of Committee on Government Operations entitled "Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase" (S. Rept. 837);

S. 2643, establishing cotton-acreage allotments for 1954 (S. Rept. 838); and

S. Res. 171, extending authority to April 20, 1954, for Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials (no written report).

Pages 38, 41-42

Executive Communications: Numerous communications from the President and from various executive departments of the Government, which had been received during the fall recess of the Senate, were referred to appropriate committees.

Pages 26-27

Joint Session: H. Con. Res. 184, providing for a joint session at 12:30 p. m. on January 7, 1954, to receive the President's message on the state of the Union, was adopted.

Page 25

President's Message on State of Union: Senate met in joint session with the House to hear President Eisenhower deliver his message on the state of the Union.

Pages 26, 62-67

Rivers and Harbors Projects: Letters from Secretary of Army transmitting communications from Chief of Engineers respecting Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., Green and Barren

Rivers, Ky., and Rogue River, Oreg., were ordered to be printed as S. Docs. 80, 81, 82, and 83, respectively.

Page 43

Banking and Currency: The following three pamphlets, prepared by the Committee on Banking and Currency, were ordered to be printed as S. Docs. 84, 85, and 86, respectively: Summary of Activities of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Legislative History of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and An Organizational Survey of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Pages 43-44

Coinage—Northampton, Mass., Founding: S. 987, commemorative coin in celebration of founding of city of Northampton, Mass., was made the Senate's unfinished business.

Page 60

Nomination: The nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be member of the NLRB, was received.

Page 61

Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 2:24 p. m. until noon Monday, January 11, when the calendar will be called for unobjected-to bills, to be followed by consideration of cotton acreage allotment bill. (Senate stood in recess today from 12:16 p. m. to 1:37 p. m. to hear the President deliver his state of the Union message in the Hall of the House of Representatives.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COTTON

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported a clean bill (S. 2643) establishing cotton-acreage allotments for 1954. The major provisions of the bill would provide:

(1) An increase from 17.9 million to 21 million acres of the national cotton-acreage allotment for 1954 (the increased acreage to be allocated on the basis of history);

(2) 315,000 additional acres allocated on a historical basis to the States as follows: 157,500 to California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and 157,500 to 14 other cotton States;

(3) An additional 59,389 acres to be allocated in such manner as to provide each State with an acreage allotment equal to 66 percent of its 1952 planted acreage (Arizona would receive 36,499 additional acres and California 22,890 additional acres);

(4) An additional 5,000 acres to Florida;

(5) That individual farms will be entitled to the larger of either 65 percent of its average cotton acreage of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted in any 1 of these 3 years, but not to exceed 50 percent of the total cropland;

(6) Voluntary surrender of unplanted acreage of individual farms to be reapportioned by county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable, and if the county cannot use such land, it may return such acreage to the State for reallocation to other counties;

(7) For purchase of Irish potatoes with section 32 funds; and

(8) Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to allot additional acres for special varieties or types of wheat in short supply.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction met in executive ses-

sion for the consideration of Air Force classified overseas construction projects, but made no announcements and will meet again Wednesday, January 13.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee met in executive session to hear Secretary of State Dulles review world developments since Congress adjourned last August. Mr. Dulles stated that it is the U. S. policy to press the Soviet Union for solutions to problems which are causing international tensions. The Secretary discussed the general situation in the areas of Korea, Indochina, the Middle East, Europe, Latin America, and the U. S. S. R.

INVESTIGATIONS

Committee on Government Operations: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations met in executive session, but made no announcements and recessed subject to call.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee resumed its hearings on the question of Hawaii statehood, with testimony from former Governor of Hawaii Ingram Stainback. Mr. Stainback testified as to the past and present Communist control of the economics of the Territory of Hawaii through the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. The witness did not complete his statement and will continue his testimony tomorrow.

The committee announced that tomorrow's session would conclude hearings on this proposed legislation.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 17 public bills, H. R. 7054-7070; 31 private bills, H. R. 7071-7101; and 7 resolutions, H. J. Res. 339-342, H. Con. Res. 193, and H. Res. 399 and 400, were introduced.

Pages 68-69

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

Third Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (H. Rept. 1097);

H. R. 2235, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif., amended (H. Rept. 1098); and

H. R. 5529, to reserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, amended (H. Rept. 1099).

Page 68

State of Union: President Eisenhower delivered his state of the Union message before a joint session of both Houses of Congress. He was escorted to and from the Chamber by a Committee composed of Senators Knowland, Johnson of Texas, and Bridges, and Representatives Halleck, Arends, and Rayburn.

The message was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed as a House document (H. Doc. No. 251).

Pages 62-67

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 1:39 p. m. until Monday, January 11, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will receive a message from the President dealing with his proposed farm program.

Committee Meetings

HEALTH INQUIRY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Chairman Wolverton announced that consideration will be resumed Monday, January 11, in connection with the committee's health inquiry. These hearings constitute a continuation of the study of methods now available to groups and individuals to protect themselves against the cost of illness and to find ways and means of improving and expanding the same. The schedule of hearings is expected to continue through February 2.

year-olds to vote. I have said, and it will be my position as a Member of the Senate, that I am not at all interested in the parentage of the bill or resolution; I am interested in the legislative child or the legislative product. Therefore I will, of course, be willing to give my wholehearted support to any appropriate resolution on this subject—whether that of the Senator from Oregon, that of the Senator from California, the majority leader, or that of any other Senator—and of course I would be exceedingly proud if it were my own resolution—which would make the proposal to grant to 18-year-olds a right to vote a reality.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article prepared by me, and which was printed in the magazine *Redbook*, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL CITIZENSHIP FOR YOUTH

(By Senator HUBERT M. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In November 1950 *Redbook* proposed that the legal United States voting age be lowered to 18. In the following editorial, Senator HUMPHREY explains why he has taken up this campaign and reports on its progress.)

On April 1 of this year I introduced an amendment to the Constitution that would permit 18-year-olds to vote. There are a number of reasons why the voting age should be lowered. We ask 18-year-olds to fight and to die for democracy; yet we do not give them the most fundamental democratic right—the right to vote. Our 18-year-olds take on tremendous responsibilities in our Armed Forces. Surely they are equal to the responsibilities of good and informed citizenship. I agree with President Eisenhower when he said, "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote."

One of the most alarming problems in our democracy today is voter apathy. Only 63 percent of our people voted in the last national election. I think that many people are more interested in politics and political issues and are better informed on these issues when they are between the ages of 18 and 21 than they are later on. When they have been out of school for a longer time, they become more absorbed in the everyday business of earning a living, and they become subject to the voter apathy which affects so many of our citizens.

The young people of this generation are better prepared educationally for political responsibility than were Americans of previous generations. Our young people would be more than mere passive voters—they could be an informative force in American politics. They have the enthusiasm and idealism of youth, and have at the same time learned to know responsibility in many walks of life. Many of them are fresh from our schools and colleges, with a lively interest in political and social affairs. They would take on their civic responsibilities at an age when they are more apt to place national interest above those more particular interests which they may later acquire.

Finally, there is no better civic training than the exercise of the vote. Without the vote, all other forms of civic training are lacking in meaning and effectiveness. It is essential that our young people take on political responsibility as soon as they are ready to do so, for the real value of education comes from its association with responsibility.

Youth ought to have a voice in determining its own future. And, what is more, it has a definite contribution to make to the future of our whole country. I hope that the Congress and the States will act soon to permit 18-year-olds to take their deserved place as full citizens.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. I had intended to submit an amendment relating to the Agricultural Administration Act, but after having a full discussion with several other Senators, and with representatives of cotton and cottonseed producers and ginneries of South Carolina, I now understand that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the leadership of its able chairman, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], have agreed upon a temporary measure in connection with cotton allotments; therefore, I shall not submit the amendment. I think the committee did a good job. I understand some amendments, with which I am in accord, will be proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as has been mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been busy during the last 2 days trying to work out solutions to a critical situation in the cotton-production program for the coming year. This morning the committee agreed upon what we believe to be a very satisfactory and fair solution of the problem.

We realize that any legislation which is to be of any use this year must be enacted promptly. We know that Senators will desire to read, as soon as they can do so, the bill approved by the Senate committee. However, I am not certain that the proposed legislation will be quite ready before the Senate concludes its session today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, that the bill may be introduced and the report filed after the adjournment or the recess of the Senate today, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the progress he and the other members of his committee have made on this very important proposed legislation. Certainly I have no objection to his reporting the bill when the Senate is not in session. I am very hopeful that the bill may be reported promptly, so that the Senate can proceed to its consideration at the very earliest possible date on which the distinguished majority leader can find a place for it on the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. We think we have found a very good solution of the problem confronting the people of Texas and other cotton-producing States. We had almost a full attendance of the committee. However, the subcommittee, consisting of the senior Senator from Minnesota

[Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], worked diligently on the bill for a much longer time than did the full committee.

It is the desire of the committee to have the bill and the report ready by tomorrow morning, if possible, so that Senators may have an opportunity to read and study them before the Senate meets next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont is agreed to.

The bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL), read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Subsequently, Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported the above bill, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 838) thereon.

ELECTION OF GOVERNOR AND SECRETARY OF ALASKA BY THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill heretofore introduced by me (S. 224) to provide for the election of the Governor and Secretary of Alaska by the people of the Territory.

My amendment simply changes the date for the first election under this bill from 1954 to 1956. This change is necessary because the filing date under the laws of Alaska for the 1954 election is very close, and there would not be time to have this change put into effect for this year's election.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska to the bill (S. 224) to provide that the Governor and the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory, was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF RECREATION ACT OF 1926, TO INCLUDE OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES AND TO PERMIT NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO LEASE PUBLIC LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes. House bill 1815 is in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill as it passed the House would permit the sale or leasing by the Federal Government of small acreages of Federal land to State or local bodies and would also permit the leasing of public land to nonprofit organizations. The

principal effect of my amendment would be to permit the sale as well as the leasing of public land to nonprofit bodies at a fair appraised value.

The bill, H. R. 1815, and my proposed amendments to it have particular application to Alaska because of the fact that over 99 percent of the land in the Territory is owned by the Federal Government. There is less than 1 percent in the hands of private parties and therefore it is almost impossible to buy land anywhere except from the Federal Government.

That situation creates a great problem, particularly for churches and other charitable and nonprofit institutions, for the reason that today there is no law under which they can acquire title to any public land. As a result, such institutions can secure title only through a special law in each case, which takes the form of a private bill. Last year the Congress passed three such private bills for the benefit of particular groups in Alaska, and it is my understanding that there are seven similar bills pending in the House committee. Until Congress gets around to taking action on these individual bills one by one, the church organization or other charitable group in each case cannot proceed with its plans for securing land or constructing necessary facilities to carry on its work.

The bill, H. R. 1815, and my amendments do not propose to give away anything. My amendments simply propose to permit such organizations to buy such land as they need at its fair value without waiting months and months for Congress to pass a special bill in each case. I hope this bill can be acted upon before the beginning of the construction season in 1954 so that such organizations can proceed in a businesslike way with their programs.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska to the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes, were received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF AN ANNUITY TO WIDOWS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2616) to provide for the payment of an annuity to widows of judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS OF COTTON—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2615) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the apportionment

of farm acreage allotments for cotton, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLIES OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 171), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress, agreed to July 28, 1953 (authorizing a full and complete investigation and study of the accessibility of critical raw materials to the United States during a time of war), and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereunder, is hereby extended to April 30, 1954.

SEC. 2. The sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be available for the expenses of the committee covering obligations incurred on or before April 30, 1954.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska subsequently, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the above resolution, reported it, without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by \$170,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 46, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953, Senate Resolution 314, 82d Congress, agreed to May 29, 1952, Senate Resolution 198, 82d Congress, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, 82d Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1955.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

- (1) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;
- (2) civil aeronautics;
- (3) domestic surface transportation;
- (4) maritime matters generally, including a continuation of the study of the maritime subsidy program, and
- (5) fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, until January 31, 1955, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$_____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF CHARITABLE AND PRIVATE WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 174), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of all charitable and private welfare organizations using the United States mails or radio, including but not limited to the solicitation and disbursement of funds by such organizations, for the purpose of—

- (1) improving the administration and enforcement of the provisions of title 18, United States Code, relating to mail fraud;
- (2) establishing standards and requirements for charitable and nonprofit organizations having or seeking Federal charters; and
- (3) recommending such other legislation as such committee or subcommittee may deem advisable as a result of its study and investigation.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee, shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued January 12, 1954
For actions of January 11, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 3

CONTENTS

Acresage allotments.....20,21,31	Farm policy.....4	Prices, support.....19,26
Adjournment.....7	Farm program.....1,8	R. E. A.....29
Animal diseases.....13	Forestry.....10,12,22	Reclamation.....17,41
Assistant Secretary.....9	Labor, farm.....38	Reports.....3,10
Banking and Currency.....18	Lands, exchange.....12	Research.....3,10
Beans.....26	public.....12	Roads.....39
Budgeting.....25	Loans, farm.....9	St. Lawrence seaway...15,28
C. C. C.....9	Meat inspection.....13	Soil conservation.....2,34
Commodity exchanges.....11	Missouri Basin.....33	Statehood.....16,27
Cotton.....20,31	Natural resources.....24	Surplus commodities...14,30
Crop insurance.....3,10	Nominations.....9	Taxation.....32,35
Economic advisors.....9	Personnel.....32,37	Veterans' benefits.....6
Electrification.....29	Pesticides.....40	Weather control.....9
Expenditures.....5,25	Postal rates.....23,36	Wheat.....19
Extension Service.....3,10	Potatoes.....21	Wool.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received President's farm-program message, and Sens. Aiken, Langer, and Dirksen, and Rep. Whitten discussed it. Senate committee reported bills to: Amend Commodity Exchange Act, permit rotation of CCC stocks, require reasonable bonds from meat packers, indemnify for swine destroyed for VE. Senate received Rizley nominations as Assistant Secretary and member of CCC Board of Directors. Senate received nominations to Federal Farm Credit Board. House committee ordered reported soil-water conservation bill. Rep. Jones (Mo.) accused Secretary of using PMA committee reorganization for patronage.

HOUSE

FARM PROGRAM. Both Houses received the President's farm-program message (H. Doc. 292) (pp. 71, 112-6). The message sets forth the following as the major features of the farm program:

"1. The new program should first be given an opportunity to start operating without the handicap of such large accumulated surpluses. This is to be done by setting aside certain quantities of our surplus commodities, eliminating them from price-support computations.

"2. The 1948 and 1949 Agricultural Acts were soundly conceived and received bipartisan support. The principles on which they were based are particularly applicable to the agricultural industry today. Although based generally upon those principles, the proposed agricultural legislation of 1954 contains certain new features, improvements and modifications.

"3. The amendment to the 1949 Agricultural Act providing for mandatory rigid supports, attuned to war needs and demonstrably unworkable in peacetime, will be permitted to expire. After the 1954 crops the level of price supports for the basic commodities will be gradually related to supply, promising farmers greater stability of income.

"4. Modernized parity is to become effective for all commodities on January 1, 1956, as scheduled by law. Provision should be made for moving from the

old to modernized parity in steps of five percentage points of the old parity per year until the change from old to modernized parity has been accomplished.

"5. The key element of the new program is a gradual adjustment to new circumstances and conditions. Application of modernized parity and the relation of basic crops to supply levels require a transition period to assure a stable farm economy. This transition should be accomplished in a prudent and careful manner to avoid sharp adjustments which would threaten the dislocation of the program.

"6. In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

"7. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to apply price supports at more than 90 percent of parity when the national welfare or national security requires should be continued.

Rep. Whitten criticized and Rep. Scudder praised the President's farm-program message (pp. 118, 126-27).

2. SOIL CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H.R. 6788, authorizing the Secretary to cooperate with States and local agencies in planning and carrying out works of improvement for soil conservation (p. D9).
3. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (p. 128):
 - Extension Service activities
 - Operations of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
 - Report of activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories
4. FARM POLICY. Rep. Jones accused the Secretary of playing partisan politics with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees and other parts of the farm program (pp. 121-23). Reps. Curtis and Arends replied to this criticism (pp. 124-26).
5. EXPENDITURES. Rep. LeCompte inserted a table of amounts authorized and expenditures made by investigating and select committees, Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1953, including the Agriculture Committee (p. 117).
6. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Rep. Sikes urged an overhauling of the veterans' loan program, claiming the present program has failed in its objectives (p. 119).
7. ADJOURNED until Thurs., Jan. 15 (p. 117).

SENATE

8. FARM PROGRAM. Sens. Aiken, Dirksen, Langer, Monroney, and others discussed various portions of the President's farm-program message. Sen. Aiken stated it "proposes a program which I believe constitutes a broad basis for enacting the best and soundest agricultural legislation which we have ever had" (pp. 86-8, 95-102).
9. NOMINATIONS. Received nominations from the President as follows:
 - Ross Rizley to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and a member of the CCC Board of Directors (pp. 103, 104).
 - Clark L. Brody, Harlan B. Munger, John D. Anderson, Raymond Sayre, H. W. Clutter, Marshall H. Edwards, Marvin J. Briggs, C. H. Matthews, Golden F. Fine, Elbert J. Hodge, Earl V. Brockman and L. V. Ritter to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board (p. 104).

Lewis W. Douglas, Alfred M. Eberle, Joseph J. George, Howard T. Orville, and Kenneth C. Spengler to be members of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control (p. 104).

Neil Jacoby and Walter Stewart as members of the Council of Economic Advisors (p. 104).

10. **REPORTS.** Received the following annual and special reports (p. 72):
 - Operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
 - Activities of the regional research laboratories
 - Operations of the agricultural experiment stations
 - Contracts for research under the Research and Marketing Act
 - Extension Service activities
 - National Forest Reservation Commission activities
11. **COMMODITY EXCHANGES.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 1990, to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; and with amendments S. 2313, to include wool among the commodities regulated by CEA (S. Repts. 839, 840) (p. 73).
12. **PUBLIC LANDS; FORESTRY.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1577, to authorize the exchange of Forest Service lands in Eagle County, Colo., for other lands in the same county and within the White River National Forest; and with amendments S. 1399, to authorize the sale of certain improvements on national forest land in Ariz. to the Salt River Valley Water Users Assn. (S. Repts. 841, 845) (p. 73).
13. **MEAT INSPECTION; ANIMAL DISEASES.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2404, to authorize the Secretary to require reasonable bonds from meat packers; and S. 2583, to indemnify owners for swine destroyed because of vesicular exanthema (S. Repts. 842, 843) (p. 73).
14. **CCC COMMODITIES.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1381, providing for rotation, etc., of old CCC commodities (S. Rept. 844) (p. 73).
15. **ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY.** Sen. Beall stated the reasons why he felt this project should not be considered at this session of Congress (pp. 84-6).
16. **STATEHOOD.** Sen. Anderson inserted a newspaper editorial stating that Hawaii and Alaska should be made States at the same time (pp. 83-4).
17. **RECLAMATION.** Sen. Watkins spoke in favor of the building of Echo Park Dam, Colo., and inserted newspaper articles defending this project (pp. 92-4).
18. **BANKING AND CURRENCY.** The Banking and Currency Committee reported original resolutions, S. Res. 182, authorizing investigation of problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, etc. (S. Rept. 846), and S. Res. 183, authorizing the study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (S. Rept. 847) (pp. 79-80).
19. **WHEAT; PRICE SUPPORTS.** Sen. Langer inserted 2 N. Dak. Farm Bureau resolutions urging legislation to amend the wheat-acreage allotment for durum wheat planters, and to continue supports at 90% of parity for basic commodities (pp. 72-3).

20. COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The "Daily Digest" states that on Jan. 9 the Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered favorably reported (but did not actually report) an amendment to S. 2643, "providing that the State committee may allocate excess acreage to small farms growing less than 5 acres of cotton" (p. D8).
21. IRISH POTATOES. Sen. Morse spoke in favor of the Welker amendment (to S. 2643) which would authorize the Secretary to use Sec. 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes (pp. 94-5).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. NATIONAL FORESTS. Rep. Tollefson inserted W. G. Hagenstein's, forest engineer for the Industrial Ass'n, recent address outlining four methods to aid in securing more timber from national forests and stating that "the Forest Service is engaged in too many extraneous activities" (pp. A105-6).
23. POSTAL RATES. Statement by Rep. Broyhill before the Subcommittee on Postal Operations discussing the issue of parcel-post size and weight limitations (pp. A107-9).
24. NATURAL RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Metcalf favoring the President's statement in his state of the Union message, "that all Federal conservation and resource development projects are being reappraised," and inserting a Washington Star editorial on this subject (p. A119).
25. BUDGET. Rep. Coudert inserted a Washington Daily News article opposing the proposal to raise the debt limit and urging enactment of H.R. 2, a bill to limit Government expenditures to income (p. A119).
26. PRICE SUPPORT. Rep. Bentley inserted the minutes of a meeting of the board of directors of the Michigan Bean Producers' Ass'n favoring price support program for beans and stating that dry edible beans should be made a basic commodity (pp. A123-4).
- Rep. Hoeven inserted a Sioux City (Iowa) Journal editorial commending the House Agriculture Committee for their "grassroots tour" (p. A125).
27. STATEHOOD. Del. Bartlett inserted a Courier-Journal article favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii (p. A129).
28. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Fallon opposing this proposed project (pp. A136-7).
29. REA. Rep. Laird inserted a Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald editorial, "REA Criticism Backfires" (p. A146).
- Rep. O'Hara inserted a St. Paul Pioneer Press editorial outlining the development of the REA and discussing the important part that former Sen. Shipstead had in this program (pp. A146-7).
30. SURPLUS FOOD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Javit's urging a program and platform for the development of a consumers' economy in this country and inserting a N. Y. World-Telegram article entitled, "Consumer's Party: Cheap Food League in Britain Should be Guide to U. S. Says Economist" (pp. A147-8).
31. COTTON. Extension of remarks of Rep. Long discussing his bill H.R. 7060, relating to cotton acreage allotments (pp. A150-3).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received messages from President on farm program and labor-management relations.

Soil-conservation study approved by House Committee on Agriculture.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 72-86

Bills Introduced: 27 bills and 10 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2644 to S. 2670; S. J. Res. 113; S. Con. Res. 54; and S. Res. 176 to S. Res. 183.

Pages 73-74, 78-80

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1990, to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, with an amendment (S. Rept. 839);

S. 2313, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act, with amendments (S. Rept. 840);

S. 1577, to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo. (S. Rept. 841);

S. 2404, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers, with an amendment (S. Rept. 842);

S. 2583, to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of the disease vesicular exanthema, with an amendment (S. Rept. 843);

S. 1381, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 relative to rotation of CCC stocks, with amendments (S. Rept. 844);

S. 1399, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, with amendments (S. Rept. 845);

S. Res. 182, authorizing Committee on Banking and Currency during period from February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, to expend additional funds of \$16,000 to study and investigate problems of economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, housing construction, Federal loan policies, and securities and exchange regulation (extension of provisions of S. Res. 42 of 83d Cong., 1st sess.) (S. Rept. 846);

S. Res. 183, authorizing Committee on Banking and Currency until January 31, 1955, to expend \$116,500 (\$83,000 in new funds and \$33,500 unexpended balance

under S. Res. 25) to make a study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (S. Rept. 847); and

S. Res. 179, continuation of authority for temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by Committee on Foreign Relations (no written report).

Pages 73, 79

President's Messages: The following two messages were received from the President, which were read and referred as indicated:

(1) Recommendations for new farm legislation (to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry), and

(2) Recommendations for certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act (to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare).

Pages 71, 111-116

Call of Calendar: The calendar was called for passage of unobjected-to bills, but no bill was passed although the following three bills were amended from the floor on motion of Senator McCarran: S. 56 and S. 59, private bills, and S. 1663, to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of U. S. courts, and U. S. attorneys.

Pages 86-92

Coinage—Northampton, Mass., Founding: S. 987, commemorative coin in celebration of city of Northampton, Mass., was temporarily displaced for the consideration of morning business and call of calendar, following which the bill was considered without action thereon.

Page 92

Treaty Received: Mutual Defense Treaty between U. S. and Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953, was received and referred to Committee on Foreign Relations (Exec. A, 83d Cong., 2d sess.).

Page 80

Nominations: 128 civilian and 1,306 armed services nominations were received.

Pages 103-110

Program for Tuesday: Senate recessed at 3:49 p. m. until noon Tuesday, January 12, when it will continue on S. 987, Northampton, Mass., coinage bill, to be fol-

lowed by H. R. 1817 and S. 2474 (commemorative coinage bills), and S. 2643, cotton acreage allotment bill.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS, AND COMMITTEE PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: On Saturday, January 9, the committee ordered favorably reported the following:

(1) An amendment to S. 2643, establishing cotton-acreage allotments for 1954, providing that the State committee may allocate excess acreage to small farms growing less than 5 acres of cotton;

(2) Without amendment, S. 1577, to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo.;

(3) With an amendment—S. 2404, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers, S. 1990, to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, and S. 2583, to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of the disease vesicular exanthema; and

(4) With amendments—S. 1381, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 relative to rotation of CCC stocks, S. 1399, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and S. 2313, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act.

The committee announced that hearings are tentatively scheduled for January 13 (pending receipt thereof) on the nomination of Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and 12 nominations to the Farm Credit Board.

It was also announced that Secretary Benson has accepted an invitation to appear before the committee on January 18 with regard to the agricultural outlook and details of the President's farm program. Also, it was announced that hearings will begin on January 21 on S. 2548, to facilitate administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

INVESTIGATIONS EXTENSION

Committee on Banking and Currency: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported two original resolutions, as follows:

(1) S. Res. 182, authorizing committee to expend additional funds of \$16,000 to study and investigate during the period from February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, such problems as (a) economic stabilization and mobilization, (b) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance, (c) construction of housing and community

facilities, (d) Federal loan policies, and (e) securities and exchange regulation (extension of provisions of S. Res. 42 of 83d Cong.); and

(2) S. Res. 183, authorizing expenditure of \$116,500 (\$83,000 new funds, \$33,500 unexpended balance under S. Res. 25, 83d Cong.) to study until January 31, 1955, the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade.

GENERAL COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Government Operations: Committee, in executive session, voted unanimously to:

(1) Refer to the Justice Department, for an opinion, the cases of 3 witnesses, 2 on the question of contempt of the committee, and a third on the question of contempt and perjury;

(2) Submit to the Justice Department, for an opinion, the question of whether or not when a witness made a statement that he had not committed espionage, he could then claim protection of the fifth amendment insofar as the entire area of espionage was concerned; and

(3) Authorize filing of a report by Senator Potter's subcommittee on Korean war atrocities. Also, the following reports were authorized to be filed next week, with no objection, unless objections to the filing are registered with the Chief Clerk by January 15 or 16 by Senators not having read such reports:

State Department Information Program—Information Centers (Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations);

Voice of America—Baker East and Baker West (a previous witness is to be recalled for clarification of earlier testimony before filing of this report);

Annual Report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations;

Activities Report of the Committee on Government Operations;

Audit Reports of Government Corporations and Agencies (full committee).

It was made a matter of record that this vote was merely an authorization to file and does not necessarily constitute an approval of the contents.

Also, the committee authorized introduction of a resolution providing funds for the Subcommittee on Reorganization consisting of the unexpended balance under S. Res. 56 of approximately \$9,800. No additional funds were requested by the subcommittee.

The committee also discussed briefly the proposed budget of \$200,000 for the Investigations Subcommittee (\$191,000 plus approximately \$9,000 unexpended balance under S. Res. 40), but deferred final action until Thursday when today's meeting will be continued.

STATEHOOD BILLS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: On Friday, January 8, the committee unanimously agreed that hear-

water." They cited more than 100 of his editorials on conservation subjects, many of which have received wide circulation beyond the borders of Utah.

Mr. Linford's award was for the field of press and radio. Other recipients of the 1953 conservation awards were Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, for his work while Governor of New Hampshire in helping to frame and secure enactment of key legislation in connection with forest management; George L. Drake, vice president of the Simpson Logging Co., of Washington, for his leadership in cooperative forestry between public and private agencies; Thomas V. Downing, Virginia State Department of Education, for his work in pushing youth programs in forestry in the Southern States; and P. H. Gladfelter, of Pennsylvania, for his pioneering work in impressing the importance of sound woodland management.

Madam President, also a very valuable aid in fighting this campaign of misinformation is an editorial published in the January 7, 1954, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, under the heading "Scenic, Recreational Values at Echo Park."

This very fine factual summary attacks the arguments now being propounded by the opponents to Echo Park, who would have the general public believe that Echo Park Dam would flood about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to this editorial, which refers to the Bureau of Reclamation's report showing that not more than 11 percent of the Dinosaur National Monument would be flooded.

Madam President, on the same subject a very excellent editorial, entitled "Time To Stop Backpedaling," appeared in the January 5, 1954, issue of the Deseret News and Telegram, of Salt Lake City. We, in the upper basin States of the Colorado River Compact, have been plagued by the false propaganda generated by pseudo-conservationists in their attempt to deprive us of our life blood, which is water. Misrepresentations and misleading phrases have been used by the opponents to Echo Park Dam as substitutes for the facts; and innocent, well-meaning organizations, victimized by this scurrilous practice, have blindly entered opposition, when if the truth were presented to them they would have entered support, instead.

Madam President, I conclude by asking unanimous consent that the three matters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1954]

ECHO PARK DAM UPHELD—ITS CONSTRUCTION DEFENDED AS PART OF NEEDED PROGRAM FOR AREA

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is disheartening to me to note that the New York Times, usually temperate and factual, is repeating the irresponsible allegations of some wilderness zealots regarding the proposal to build Echo Park Dam.

Your editorial No Dam at Dinosaur of December 22 repeats the familiar shocker

that this dam (in a remote and almost inaccessible section of western Colorado) would destroy one of the West's great scenic preserves and that Secretary McKay's decision is, as the Sierra Club of California claims, a threat to the national park system.

Actually, as many sincere conservationists have testified, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Reservoir, scheduled for later construction, would flood nothing much of scenic, historical, or geological value except in a small section of the canyon, and this can be duplicated in a hundred other areas.

ALTERNATIVE SITES

Your editorial argues that alternative dams could be constructed outside the national monument that would accomplish the purpose of Echo Park Dam without destroying forever one of the unique remnants of primeval America. These alternative sites have been subjected to intensive engineering scrutiny and were studied just recently by Under Secretary of Interior Tudor before the Interior Department approved the plans. The sheltering canyons and low temperatures prevailing at Echo Park, plus other considerations, make it far the superior site.

This dam is called the "wheelhorse" of the nine-dam upper Colorado River Basin storage project and many elements enter into the complex picture. Evaporation loss is paramount. The "most favorable" alternative site—as to storage, cost economy, electric power production, and so forth—would evaporate 300,000 more acre-feet of water annually than would Echo Park. Such a water loss would supply a good-sized city, would irrigate 200,000 acres of western land, now needing such water, and would supply an agricultural livelihood for more than 20,000 persons.

In addition, substitution of another dam or dams for Echo Park would eliminate from the upper basin program Split Mountain and the Gray Canyon Dams downstream on Green River.

The upper Colorado River Basin program must be considered as an entity. It is carefully integrated and balanced—as to storage, power links, other use of water and as to repayment to the Government. Eliminating or radically changing one element in the coordinated plan could throw the overall program out of balance, making it economically or otherwise unfeasible.

USE OF WATER

This program is the only means by which Utah, Colorado, and other upper basin States can fulfill their compact obligations to the lower basin States and put to beneficial use their share of the Colorado River water. Perhaps one has to live in this semi-arid country to realize just how important this "last water hole" is to the region.

You warn that Echo Park is a kind of foot in the door—a threat to the inviolability policy of national parks. I read of no such alarmist material about construction of the great tunnel and water and power works in the Colorado Big Thompson reclamation project. And I have not been aware of mourning over the "damage" to the scenic or recreational value done by these works to the immensely popular Rocky Mountain National Park.

The 1938 presidential order increasing the size of Dinosaur National Monument from the 80-acre "Dinosaur graveyard" to 200,000 acres, including the Green and Yampa Canyons, clearly contemplated future use of the area for a water project. Moreover, Park Service spokesmen made definite pledges to residents of this area that the monument extension would not interfere with such a project.

With so much at stake in the battle over the public lands it is difficult to understand why Echo Park is being made the blazing symbol of conservation at this time. The epidemic of editorials and intemperate statements arouses the suspicion that Echo Park

is the mere window dressing for a behind-the-scenes movement of far greater consequence to the Intermountain West and, indirectly, to the Nation.

ERNEST H. LINFORD.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, January 2, 1954.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 7, 1954]

SCENIC, RECREATIONAL VALUES AT ECHO PARK

Anomalies and ironies are multiplying in the hysterical campaign against the proposed Echo Park Dam.

The Washington news conference show held this week by vociferous opponents of the key storage power project in the upper Colorado River Basin program was clearly an attempt to inflame public opinion prior to the congressional hearing scheduled for January 18. The wild and fantastic statements made in the name of impressive-sounding organizations might well cause rank-and-file members of these organizations to examine aims and leadership long and hard. Good would accrue from the calamity howling if Congress were moved to look behind the facade and probe the financial backing of some self-styled conservation groups involved in the emotional crusade.

Ironically, some foot dragging and downright opposition comes from Colorado, the State in which Echo Park Dam would be built, and which would receive more than half the firm water rights and other benefits from the upper basin program. The dam, which would be just below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, in Dinosaur National Monument, 2 miles east of the Utah-Colorado line, would be constructed under Colorado labor laws and contractors and others would be subject to Colorado taxation. Denver and other Colorado cities would benefit from the electrical power output as would other communities in both upper and lower basins.

Vernal, Utah, less than 30 miles from the damsite, and other Uintah Basin communities would benefit economically in many ways from the dam project because of their close proximity and because of the low-cost electric power it would make available.

Fish and wildlife spokesmen have joined in the loud wall about Echo Park, yet neither the Green nor the Yampa currently yields any fish but the "trash" variety. The creation of miles of quiet, clear water in the canyon bottoms would pave the way for splendid bass and trout fishing in the park and the wildlife situation there could be improved otherwise.

A sportsmen's group leader, writing in the Denver Post, says Echo Park Dam would "flood out about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons" of the Green and Yampa. And a Los Angeles Times columnist writes that the dam's "vague in purpose and staggering cost, would flood virtually every inch of them (the canyons)."

Bureau of Reclamation reports assert, on the other hand, that rivers within the Dinosaur Monument now inundate about 3 percent of the area. After construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams the total flooded area would be increased to about 11 percent of the monument, with most of the increase in the vicinity of Pat's Hole, near the dam. The water would be deep, of course, at the dam, but farther up the canyon gorges—in the areas of best scenery—the reservoirs would gradually decrease in depth.

There are many definitions of beauty and scenic values, but it would seem that covering sandbars, sagebrush, and rubble in the bottom of a canyon would improve the general appearance to many unprejudiced eyes. In the steep canyons the dams would result in widening the present water channel only 1½ to 3 times.

Some sincere wilderness enthusiasts see a concrete dam as sinister and horribly ugly, artificially held water as a crime against nature. Yet annual figures on recreational visits to Hoover Dam and Lake Mead indicate that the popularity of this national recreation area, administered by the National Park Service, is exceeded only by that of Yellowstone National Park. Some hardy outdoorsmen abhor the idea of opening a wilderness area to the public and fight all means of making such sections more accessible. These and others would put preservation of a wild land above the economic and agricultural development of a whole region. Their attitude is hardly consistent with the concept of serving the best interests of the largest number.

[From the Desert News and Telegram of January 5, 1954]

TIME TO STOP BACKPEDALING

Three years ago the Federated Utah Artists learned a lesson on the importance of facts. It is a lesson we submit—not very hopefully—for the consideration of a good many people who badly need it.

The association of artists at its annual meeting in January 1951 had before it a proposed resolution opposing construction of Echo Park Dam. Sentiment was high in favor of the resolution. After all, these were artists, interested mainly in preservation of beauty. Other artist organizations throughout the country were opposing the dam on the basis of what they had been told. The resolution seemed certain to sweep through the Utah group in the same way.

Then, just before a vote was to be taken, someone rose to ask whether more information wasn't needed. The membership agreed it was. A committee was appointed to investigate.

In the fall of 1951, after a summer of looking into the problem, the committee—chaired, incidentally, by the person who made the original motion—made its report. It concluded that building the dam would make possible development of a beautiful recreation area, that concern about the much-discussed destruction of areas of geological and archaeological value is a myth, that there is no comparable alternative site, and that Utah has many other canyons of comparable or greater beauty and wonder from the aesthetical or any other point of view.

That ended that particular resolution against construction of the dam.

What a pity that so many other well-intentioned but misguided organizations and individuals who are making such a public clamor over the dam haven't bothered to similarly inform themselves.

For make no mistake about it, the Echo Park Dam still has rough going ahead. It has been approved by the Secretary of Interior for immediate action, but Congress still holds the purse strings. Congressmen live on votes, and the national campaign of misinformation is going to make a good many Congressmen tread very softly—or not at all—where this project is concerned.

We might as well face it. California wants Colorado River water that belongs to Utah. As long as Echo Park and other upper Colorado River project dams go unbuilt, she will get that water. So the present campaign will continue. And it is effective. Shibboleths such as "bureaucratic boondoggling," "stealing the public's inheritance," "destroying nature's wonderland," and other empty phrases make an effective substitute for facts in the public mind.

It is time, we believe, to stop backpedaling and apologizing and explaining.

It is time Utah and Colorado and other States with a stake in the lifeblood of the Colorado took the ball away from the pseudo-

conservationists and did some ground-gaining for themselves.

We suggest that the chambers of commerce of Utah and western Colorado cities and other organizations interested in the economic development of this area cooperate in building a fund to acquaint key people in the Nation with exactly what we have here. Let's challenge the opponents of these dams to come out here themselves and actually take a look, not only at the canyons in question but also at others along the Green and Colorado and San Juan equally worthy of public recognition.

A task force of the Department of Interior saw for itself last summer and was convinced. So did a House Interior Committee. Whenever the facts have been studied, as the Utah artists studied them, the projects have won approval.

And yet, the Los Angeles Times, in a typical sob-sister story, writes:

"When people of the United States discover what they own in these unscarred, unsurpassed, unbelievable canyons, they will no more surrender them up for materialist uses than they would a Yosemite, a Zion, or a Crater Lake."

Mere facts never catch up with that kind of romantic tripe. Not unless we find some way to expose it to the public for what it is. And unless we do, the upper Colorado River project may never get beyond its blueprint.

FINANCING OF MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 987, a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the centennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass. I understand that following the disposition of that bill, another special coinage bill will be considered.

For a number of years Congress has been enacting bills of this character. I have had pending, both in the House and in the Senate at different times, a bill to provide for the completion of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by the issuance of a special coin. If now it is to be the policy to consider bills of this character, I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will give early consideration to my bill, Senate bill 1657.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1657) to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to complete the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals of the four Presidents of the United States there sculptured—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt—there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 2 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design carrying a replica of the memorial to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior. The United States shall not be sub-

ject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage but may accept the services to be provided by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society therefor and may accept such other services as may be contributed in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, incorporated under the laws of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the said Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society or at the studio of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the following purposes: (1) To provide additional parking space in the Mount Rushmore Reserve and adequate comfort and sanitary facilities for visitors; (2) to complete the monument as specified by the models in the administration building maintained by the National Park Service at the memorial, such completion to be under the direction of Lincoln Borglum under the general supervision of the National Park Service; (3) to remove a portion of the debris at the base of Rushmore Mountain and to construct there an appropriate open-air amphitheater suitable for holding public gatherings on historical occasions; (4) to complete the construction of the Hall of Records and the native stone stairway and other features of the memorial as originally conceived by the sculptor, Gutzon Borglum; all such expenditures and construction to be under the supervision of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material; and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of a 10-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last bill on the calendar today was Calendar 831, Senate bill 2643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I understand that it was objected to primarily as a matter of procedure because the bill is to be brought up for consideration and full debate in the very near future.

The bill contains an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], which deals with a very serious Irish-potato problem in the Pacific Northwest.

I received today a series of telegrams from some leaders in the potato industry in my State, representing the potato growers. I ask that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDMOND, OREG., January 11, 1954.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

ROY SNABEL,
Chairman, Oregon-California
Marketing Committee.

REDMOND, OREG., January 11, 1954.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Work for passage of bill on floor of Senate permitting Secretary of Agriculture the use of section 32 funds to divert Irish potatoes.

H. W. STEELHAMMER,
President, Central Oregon Potato
Growers Association.

REDMOND, OREG., January 11, 1954.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Back legislation to pass bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes. We need this help.

BEN DAVIDSON,
Administrator, Oregon Potato Committee.

Mr. MORSE. The first telegram is typical. It reads as follows:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

I have been informed that what the potato growers of Oregon are seeking to do is to obtain authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds for the purchase of potatoes in such programs as the school-lunch program. It is claimed by the Secretary of Agriculture that at the present time he does not have such authority. It seems to me obvious, Madam President, that such authority should be given him. The Welker amendment is a sound one. I not only support it, but I shall urge its favorable consideration when the bill comes up for debate in the near future.

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know that I have anything world-shaking to say about the farm problem. It is a little difficult to make one's self heard with the overtones in the galleries. I hope they will subside, so that this feeble voice of mine may reach into the appropriate corners of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Let there be order on the floor and in the galleries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By way of prelude, let me say that I am unequivocally and unreservedly for the President's agricultural program.

As Senators know, I come from the Corn Belt. Next to Iowa, Illinois produces more corn than any other commonwealth in the entire United States. We think of corn not only in terms of a cereal grain, but also in terms of its

use in the commercial market. It is the fact that roughly 80 of every 100 bushels of corn produced go into livestock. Consequently we cannot think of the livestock problem without thinking of the corn problem.

In my section of the country we measure corn not only in terms of bushels, but also in terms of gallons on occasion, because it enters into the commercial market in a rather large way.

As I sense the President's program, in seeking to simplify what I think are its fundamental items, I should say that it would permit mandatory supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity to expire with the 1954 crop. Secondly, it would provide for flexible parity based upon supply after 1955. Under present law there is authority to use the old or the modernized parity on basic commodities, which authority expires January 1, 1956.

There is also what is known as adjusted or transitional parity. That is nothing more than an adjustment, to enable us to go from the old to the new formula.

The plan also provides the setting aside of about one-half the commodities now owned by the Government, for a variety of purposes, including national defense, the school-lunch program, and other diversions, so long as they do not have any effect upon the commercial market.

I think the effect of the program is very nicely stated in the President's message at the bottom of page 6, under the heading "Conclusion." I could do no better, for the purpose of my remarks, than to read it. It reads as follows:

It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

It has some other objectives, of course, but those are all that are necessary for my purpose.

If I were to recite the reasons why I think this is a sound program, I should say, first of all, that it is fundamental. Secondly, it conforms to certain basic economic principles. I believe it is fair to every segment of our society, including both producers and consumers. I think it presents the best hope for some kind of durable solution, after nearly 30 years of failure. When all is said and done, in connection with the farm problem, we are back where we were 30 years ago.

In indicating to the Senate why I am in favor of this program, I think it would be well to invite attention to a little history.

I was in the House of Representatives in 1933, when there was agricultural distress in the United States. I remember how we wrestled and struggled in the hope that we might find a practicable, workable, and durable solution.

Those were the days when it was urged—and I suppose with some truth—that we were destroying little pigs, and probably trying to teach birth control to

the rest of the hog population, in order to overcome the surplus problem. Those were the days when we were talking about plowing under every third row of cotton. I would be less than candid if I did not confess that there was distress in agricultural areas, because corn was selling at a very low price, and so were hogs. Senators know what the price of wheat was at that time. I very freely confess that there was an agricultural stringency, and that the spectral hand of foreclosure was moving over the country.

Nor would I be quite candid if I did not at least say that the emergency programs which we had in 1933, in some degree, at least, represented decisive action, whether right or wrong. I have not had too many pleasant things to say about the New Deal, but I will say at least that there was decisive action at that time. It was sought to meet something which was an emergency if we ever saw one.

We had ever so many farm measures in those days. There was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1934. I am not sure whether my esteemed colleague [Mrs. SMITH of Maine] was in the House at that time or not. That measure was the beginning of an entire series of legislative proposals, which went back, in large part, to the basic Agricultural Adjustment Act. As I saw the legislative program unfold, I sometimes wondered whether or not we were getting into an atmosphere of confusion. I tried on occasion to spell out all the things which were designed, first, to increase productivity; second, to increase production; and third, to cut it down by acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and otherwise. Then of course there was the attempt to put it all together to determine whether it was a realistic, reasonable, and consistent program.

Let us consider productivity for a moment. Let us remember the improvement in fertilizers, the amount of money expended in order to make the soil produce more, and the expenditure of money which resulted in producing more corn. More cotton can be produced per acre, and more wheat can be produced per acre, and more of everything can be produced per acre.

I remember not so long ago when, on the basis of averages, 25 bushels of corn per acre seemed a good yield in the Corn Belt. Today 100 bushels and even in excess of 150 bushels are grown. All those improvements have been made on the productivity side.

So far as production is concerned, let us consider the potato situation. I remember when millions of bushels of potatoes were made inedible by being dyed with an indelible dye or by being sprinkled with kerosene.

It seemed for all the world as though the conjunction of good weather, rainfall, and fertility in the acres devoted to potatoes produced more potatoes than ever before. The result was, of course, that not only did the price go down, but it became necessary, out of the Public Treasury, with the dollars of the taxpayers, to support the price; and the

further the price went down the more support was required. The cost ran into hundreds of millions of dollars.

We had a similar situation with respect to eggs. I think the policy finally was to buy them in order to support the price, and to dry them. Many drying plants were developed. Then they had to be stored somewhere. I recall as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House that we caused an investigation to be made of a cave which the Government took over in Kansas. It was air conditioned and electrically lighted, so that the equivalent of literally millions or dozens of eggs could be stored there. The hens had become too productive. The balanced ration fed them had become too effective. So there we were, with a surplus. We had to move in and take over. I am afraid the aroma finally reminded the people of the United States what such a program would finally lead to.

In all this time, despite all the plasters which were placed upon the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and all the implementing legislation which was passed up to 1949, there was no solution to the problem. I say that very kindly, and I express the hope at the same time that this will not become a very tart and severe partisan issue. I do not see how we can put it on a partisan basis. I mean to be just as kindly about it as I can. Probably some testy things could be said. However, I am content to say now that the farm problem was never solved at any time since I first came to Congress in 1932.

The best answer I know is the bulging bins we have today, the waste, the losses, the giveaways, and all the rest. With all that, we are plagued in the year of our Lord 1954 with surpluses such as we have never seen before.

What finally did solve the problem—or rather sidetrack it, because it cannot be called a solution—was the intervention of war, with its attendant inflation, and all the evil and ulcerous things which come out of the crucible of war. There was a giveaway program. When other countries saw their economy slipping and they could not till their soil, obviously we had to dip into the American economy to help them maintain a solid front and enable them to retain their vitality as allies in a worldwide effort.

We had troops in the field. The demands upon our economy were necessarily multiplied. So, of course, the economy had to be stimulated in wartime. The fact of the matter is that nearly 1 out of every 3 bushels of wheat which we produced went abroad at that time. Nearly 1 out of every 3 bales of cotton went abroad for one purpose or another. Probably the equivalent of 1 out of every 3 bushels of rice went abroad. So there was an almost unlimited area in which our farm commodities could find a market with the qualification, however, that the very farmers who produced the surpluses had to pay, in part, through their taxes, for that kind of giveaway program.

Frankly, that is not a solution. I am sure that no one would have the temer-

ity to stand up and say that it was a solution. But we must confess that the problem was sidetracked.

We must also confess that the problem was sidetracked because a false prosperity, which was conditioned upon conflict and broken bodies, had sidetracked it. Surplus labor had gone into the war plants. Wages were firm and reasonably high, and there was great buying power in the country. That helped to sidetrack the problem. But God forbid that anyone should ever undertake to call that a solution, when it depends upon sending young Americans into all corners of the earth, and sending materiel, munitions, and all the other things that such a condition involves. A synthetic and artificial condition was produced in our country which sidetracked the problem for the time being.

We have now reached the point where it seems that we can diminish the number of our troops abroad in small part, because of the progress we have made in the field of atomic weapons. It seems that we do not need quite so many of the accoutrements of war; and when we do not need them, we do not need quite so many men to operate them. I think it is fair to say that probably we shall experience some reaction in our country—how much or how little, we do not know.

War is an abnormal thing; and when we excise it from our economy, it is the same as removing a hideous, cancerous growth from the body. There is a little pain accompanying the operation; but I am confident that we have not only the courage, but the capacity and vitality, to take it in stride and see it through.

Here we are with respect to this problem which has been gathering momentum for a long time, except when it was sidetracked temporarily by the conditions to which I have referred. We have been floundering again, and we are in an area of confusion.

I think it is interesting perhaps, to note that our friends on the other side, at their national convention in 1948, wrote a provision in their platform which endorsed the principle of a permanent system of flexible price supports. It intrigued me a great deal; in fact, two suggestions intrigued me: First, the one respecting flexible price supports, such as the President now advocates, and, secondly, the one making it a "permanent system." Certainly, those who wrote that provision in the platform were doing their earnest and most sincere best in order to find a basis for what looked like a durable and workable policy.

Immediately thereafter came another proposal. I examined rather carefully the suggestion made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in Des Moines, Iowa. Many people had gathered there. Then, of course, the attack began, and I am delighted now that the Congress saw fit to turn that proposal aside, because I have no idea, nor does any finite mind, what the Brannan plan, with its almost unlimited provisions, would accomplish, in paying the difference between the price the market would bear and what the price should be. Who can estimate what the burden

upon the Federal Treasury would have been?

Then came the act of 1948. I think my friend from Tennessee was in the House at that time, and I know he gave a great deal of attention to the act to extend high supports until 1949, as I recall, and then we were to drop back to a flexible basis in 1950.

As I understand, the act of 1949 was extended through 1950, with a provision that the flexible scale should not become effective until 1951 and 1952.

There was action in the Congress last year dealing with the same problem. If I correctly remember—and I would do no Member of this body an injustice—I thought at the time of the discussion the word "temporary" was used. In other words, it was not a solution. So we had to wait for new facts and data to assure that a sound program would be enacted.

Mr. President, I have indicated briefly the unhappy inheritance President Eisenhower received in the agricultural field. He can say with truth that he received an unsolved problem that was only temporarily aborted and sidetracked by the conflict which intervened, and that in fact we are about where we were 20 or more years ago. He can say, of course, that there has been a diminution of export markets. Certainly we are stimulating the export of agricultural commodities, but nations are today stimulating their own production; they are trying to develop a self-sustaining basis for themselves. In addition to that, many countries, directly and indirectly, developed war debts of their own that have to be paid. Consequently, they have to turn to that field of activity and endeavor to find something with which to pay their debts.

This is a reasonably kindly observation to make, Mr. President. I do not believe we looked the economic facts of life fully in the face when we were dealing with agriculture.

I remember that Mr. Truman went to Detroit and said he thought the farmers would be ungrateful if they did not vote for his ticket. I think he could have better served the country if he had told the whole story and everything involved in it and told them that here was a shadow which was going to plague not only his party but the Republican Party, and the entire Nation as well.

Congress provided that 66 million acres could be used for the production of wheat at 90 percent of parity, when the Department of Agriculture, under their own findings, said the amount should not be more than 55 million acres.

If we are going properly to serve the farmers of the country and the Nation itself we must be courageous about it and put aside some of the political considerations which have too freely intervened.

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that any feeble effort on my part or any mere words are going to dispel political considerations, but I think it is proper to remind everyone that if there should be a crucifixion it will not be a case of crucifying one party or the other; it will be a case of hanging the country upon an economic cross.

I do not want to be charged with that responsibility. Like Pilate, I do not

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued January 13, 1954

For actions of January 12, 1954

83rd-2nd, No. 4

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Acreage Allotments.....1	Farm Program.....7	St. Lawrence Seaway.....8,12
Banking and Currency...2	Personnel.....10	Trade, Foreign.....3
Cotton.....1	Price Supports.....4,9	Treaties.....5,11
Electrification.....6	<i>POTATOES</i>	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed cotton-allotments bill and requested conference.

SENATE

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6665, providing for cotton-acreage allotments for 1954 (pp. 140-66). Sens. Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, Schoeppel, Welker, Ellender, Hoey, Johnston (S. C.), Holland, Anderson, Eastland, and Clements were appointed as conferees (p. 166). Agreed to an Eastland amendment (on behalf of the committee) providing, under certain conditions, for apportionment by the State committee of unallocated acreage directly to farms so as to provide each farm with a minimum allotment (pp. 141, 157). Rejected a Douglas amendment requiring that any acreage in excess of 3 acres withdrawn from cotton production shall be used only for growing of nitrogen-fixing crops (pp. 164-5).

Irish potato amendment re sec 32 funds (pp 153-154) by Sen. Welker discussed by Sen Anderson et al
2. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Chairman Capehart of the Banking and Currency Committee announced that hearings on S. Res. 183, to continue the study of operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade, have been indefinitely postponed (p. D12).

3. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the President a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements (p. 131).

4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Langer inserted a Kildeer, N. Dak. merchants' resolution opposing "any attempt to disrupt the present farm stabilization program" (p. 133).
5. TREATIES. Sen. Wiley inserted a resolution by the Fourth National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order opposing any constitutional amendment to limit the treaty-making power (p. 133).
6. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Dairyland Power Cooperative resolution praising the work of REA and TVA and urging Congress to continue to develop natural resources for the benefit of all and on an overall river-basin development basis (pp. 133-34).
7. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Aiken inserted a set of questions and answers made up by this Department to clarify the new farm-program recommendations embodied in the President's farm message (pp. 135-36).
8. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Bill, S. 2150, was made the unfinished business (p. 166).

HOUSE

9. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Hope issued the following statement on Jan. 11:
"The President's message on agriculture expresses general approval of the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 enacted by the 81st Congress but suggests the approach to the price support levels contained in that legislation be made gradually.
"It is proposed also to segregate and sterilize considerable quantities of existing CCC stocks until they can be liquidated in an orderly manner.
"Since there are wide differences of opinion among farmers as well as Members of Congress on the proposals contained in the message, it is the intention of the Committee on Agriculture to hold extensive hearings on the matter here in Washington. These hearings will begin as soon as possible after the conclusion of our field hearings and the disposal of certain other matters now pending before the Committee, but not before February 15."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. PERSONNEL. Sen. Wiley inserted a Boston Globe article discussing a 9 month study by Sen. Saltonstall of the "shocking waste of life and limb that has been going on for years among Federal employees" and "the lack of any real safety program" (p. A155).
11. TREATIES. Sens. Bricker and Schoeppel inserted articles and editorials favoring, and Sen. Kefauver inserted several articles opposing, the proposed Bricker constitutional amendment to limit the treaty-making powers (pp. A157-58, A160, A162-63).
12. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Butler inserted a Philadelphia Inquirer editorial opposing this project (pp. A159-60).

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS JAN. 13: Rizley and Farm Credit Board nominations, S. Agriculture (Rizley to testify).

-0-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654, or send to Room 105A.

June 15, 1925,¹ Detroit, Mich., violation of Dyer Act.

August 29, 1925, St. Louis, Mo., concealed weapon; discharged.

August 29, 1925,¹ Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

October 6, 1925,¹ Detroit, Mich., carrying offensive weapons; discharged.

May 24, 1926,¹ Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

March 31, 1929,¹ Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

May 15, 1927,¹ Detroit, Mich., disturbing the peace; \$5 or 10 days.

August 8, 1927, Windsor, Ontario, possession of offensive weapons; 3 years; served 30 months.

May 19, 1930, Watertown, N. Y., violation National Motor Vehicle Act; turned over to Detroit court, Detroit, Mich.

February 26, 1931, Jackson, Mich., robbery, armed; 15 to 30 years.

December 15, 1950, Youngstown, Ohio, violation of parole.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the senior Senator from Delaware.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware stated a few moments ago that he was unable to get a report on Frank Cammarata from the Treasury Department because the Senator is not a member of a committee. Frankly, I do not understand the situation. I always understood that any Member of the Senate could at any time write to any member of the Cabinet and get a reply.

I should like to inquire what the situation is in this case and why the Senator cannot get a reply with reference to this particular racketeer case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I can get a reply from the Treasury Department, but as to getting certain information I had asked for I cannot get it. I should like to read to the Senator from North Dakota excerpts from a letter which I received from the Treasury Department with reference to the case. I had asked certain questions, such as who had settled the case, what the procedure was, the amount of tax delinquency, as well as terms of settlement. I quote from the reply which I received from the Treasury Department:

Specifically, we can tell you, in response to your first question, that Cammarata did fail to file income-tax returns for the period you mentioned.

The letter goes on to say:

An investigation covering most of the years you mentioned was made in 1948. We are securing additional details about the case from our field office. As soon as we receive this information, we will be in a position to reply more fully to some of your remaining questions. To what extent we can furnish you with information as to how the case was finally adjusted and settled, and the amounts involved, cannot be definitely stated at this time since section 55 will have some pertinence with respect to this type of data.

¹ These arrests are unsupported by fingerprints in the Department of Justice files.

I may say further to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is the typical situation which a Senator encounters when he does not enjoy official committee status. That was the reason I had asked for a special subcommittee, so that I could follow through on these cases. The complete answer should be obtained and given to the American people.

However, it has been definitely established that Cammarata did not file tax returns, for the period indicated. He was not prosecuted.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE TERCENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 719, S. 2474, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I hope the bill pending before the Senate will be passed. This year New York City will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its founding. A committee composed of distinguished citizens of New York has been appointed to conduct the anniversary celebration in a manner consistent with the dignity and stature of the great city. The event will serve to demonstrate to the people of our country and peoples abroad the tremendous importance of New York City both in domestic and foreign affairs.

I wish to point out that the passage of the bill will cause no substantial expense to the United States. The bill definitely provides that the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage shall not be borne by the United States, and that such coins shall be issued only upon payment of the face value of the coins by the committee which is in charge of the celebration.

New York City is not only the largest city in the State of the New York but is also the oldest. It is certainly the largest city in the United States, and, with the possible exception of London, the largest city in the world.

New York City has for three centuries played a very prominent part in the history of our country. It has been a Dutch city, a British city, and for the past 180 years an American city. It has been active in industry and commerce and in the cultural, educational, and

spiritual life of the Nation. The issuance of the special coinage is a small but very appropriate recognition of the great part which New York City has played in the life of our Nation and of the free world.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is not on the floor. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the senior Senator from New York is a cosponsor of the bill, and that he filed the report of the subcommittee, of which I was the chairman, and he also filed the report of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 724) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill authorizes the Director of the Mint, in commemoration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, to coin not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces. However, the initial number of such pieces to be coined would not be less than 200,000, which is slightly less than 1 week's production of coins on 1 press and is sufficiently large that it precludes the issue from acquiring an artificial-scarcity value.

Your committee wishes to emphasize that provision is made in the bill that the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparation for their coinage shall not be borne by the United States.

The Treasury Department is authorized to issue to the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration the commemorative coins upon payment of the face value of such coins. The coins are to be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the above-mentioned committee. The committee is, of course, a nonprofit organization, and any proceeds from the sale of the coin above par shall be used only for the purposes of participating in the tercentennial celebration of the foundation of the city of New York.

Your committee is fully aware that the Treasury Department for a number of years has consistently objected to the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins; and, while recognizing that there is much to be said for the objections which are raised to the policy of authorizing commemorative coins, it is your committee's considered judgment that exceptions should be made to the general policy when the event to be celebrated is, in the opinion of the Congress, of such magnitude and of such historical importance in the life of our country and its institutions that it deems the event should be commemorated.

The possible small additional cost to the United States in the issuance of the commemorative coin which this bill authorizes and which from time to time the Congress may authorize is, in your committee's opinion, far outweighed by the benefits that redound us as a people and a Nation. Our history, our traditions, our institutions are historic benchmarks in the development of the Nation, and their commemoration is

symbolic of the spiritual and political development of the Nation, and they help as does our flag, to instill in the minds of our people that patriotic and spiritual fervor, without which we as a Nation cannot survive. We must be just as vigilant—in fact, more vigilant—about maintaining and encouraging the spiritual resources of the Nation as we are about the preservation and development of our physical and economic resources. The material resources of a nation can be dissipated or destroyed; the spirit, tradition, and sacred history of a nation, if reasonably protected and developed, will not only never die but will serve also to make it strong physically and economically.

With this in mind, your committee believes that the foundation of the city of New York is of such genuine national and historical interest that it is fitting and proper that a coin be issued in commemoration of the 300th anniversary.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

When Peter Stuyvesant and his council in 1653 proclaimed a grant of municipal government, placing city affairs in charge of 2 burgomasters (mayors), 5 schepens (councilmen), and a "shout" (prosecutor), western democracy was born in America. That municipal council was the first democratic institution on this continent. It, therefore, is your committee's belief that the celebration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York exceeds the boundaries of New York City.

In fact, the celebration of the foundation of the city of New York is of international importance. In 1783 negotiations started between the Dutch and the Continental Congress, which led to a loan of 5 million guilders for what is now the city of New York. It was in the city of New York that a farmer by the name of Klaes Martensen van Roosevelt arrived in the year 1650. He became the common ancestor of seven Presidents of the United States—James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The city of New York, thus, historically and today is truly one of the first cities, not only of the State of New York but of the United States. It is our largest city, and its size, its importance, its tremendous development, and, to a very large extent, its history is dependent and inextricably tied to the history and development of our Nation.

It is therefore fitting that the 300th anniversary of the foundation of this great city be commemorated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the foundation of the city of New York, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces shall not be less than 200,000: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such committee in connection with the observance of said tercentennial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. JOHN ZIGBDIS, MEMBER OF THE GREEK PARLIAMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, I am happy to announce to the Senate that we have as a guest in the Senate Chamber, Dr. John Zigbdis, a member of the Greek Parliament for 4 years, and formerly Minister of Industry in the Greek Cabinet.

I am sure that our colleagues are happy to welcome Dr. Zigbdis as a representative of a courageous and friendly nation, and I hope as many Members as can do so will come and greet him. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it had been my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H. R. 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; but, at the request of the minority, because both Senators from Louisiana are at present absent from the floor, I shall not move the consideration of the bill at this time. Instead, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, S. 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. However, as soon as the Senators from Louisiana enter the Chamber, I shall ask that the agricultural bill be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may extend the same courtesy to the Senators from Louisiana with respect to the coinage bill which was extended to the other Senators with reference to the other coinage bills.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, Senate bill 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the cotton-acreage proposal contained in the bill does not alter the permanent legislation which is now on the statute books. All through the bill, as it comes before the Senate, an effort is made to provide temporary legislation for the 1954 growing season. If, subsequently, it is desired to make changes, that can be done after hearings have been held and an opportunity given to all persons to be heard upon it. That is why a great many things which might have been considered in the bill have been postponed for subsequent action.

It is extremely important that the cotton farmers know what their allocations for 1954 are going to be sufficiently early so that they may make their plans for their planting.

The planting season for cotton varies greatly among the States now receiving quotas under the law. There are States where the planting will start early in February or probably late in January. There are other States which do not need to know their quotas until perhaps March or April, but, nonetheless, if the bill is to pass, it should be passed immediately and the Secretary of Agriculture, at the earliest possible moment, should give to the States an opportunity to know what their quotas are going to be.

The bill does 3 or 4 things. It starts by providing that the acreage allotment, which is at present restricted to a sufficient number of acres to produce 10 million bales of cotton, which the Secretary of Agriculture has determined to be 17,910,000 acres, may be increased to a minimum of 21 million acres. That is the first temporary relief which the bill provides.

I may say that that temporary relief is based upon the fact that the present acreage is somewhere in the neighborhood of 26 million. It might normally come down to 18 million acres if the 10-million-bale limitation should be enforced, and this bill is a halfway step toward what the final limitation would be. It gives the farmer 2 years in which to adjust, rather than a single year, and for that reason seems to be desirable.

While the bill does not exactly follow the recommendations the Secretary of Agriculture announced some time ago, it does come to about the same figure, because he said he would make a recommendation that acreage be increased to 21 million acres, once the first step had been taken.

Then the bill contains a provision for some hardship acreage, which runs to a total of 315,000 acres. One-half of that has been allotted to the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States, excluding those which receive minimum allotments under the so-called minimum production plan. For example, the State of Nevada gets a minimum allotment, which is not necessarily taken care of by this special arrangement.

There is an additional provision that the acreage of no State shall be cut more than 34 percent. That applies specifically and only to the States of Arizona and California. Since those States have an irrigated cotton situation, it is extremely difficult to cut back the acreage very rapidly. Farmers, perhaps realizing that there were no quotas last year, went ahead and planted to cotton a rather large number of acres during 1953. Some of that acreage is within old, well-established areas that would get quotas, but when farmers have gone to the expense of installing pumps and various other appliances required for cotton farming on irrigated land, it is extremely difficult to cut back quotas suddenly, though it was felt that it may be possible gradually to take care of this situation. So there is special consideration given to those two States for the year 1954 only.

I say special consideration is accorded to those two States for the year 1954 only, because by 1955, the quota which may be established for 1955 will take into consideration the very high plantings in the States of Arizona and California. It is my belief, and I am certain it is the belief of others, that after 1954 the California and Arizona situations will be taken care of by the history which those States have.

The allotments are made to the other States on the basis of their history for the last 5 years. Taking into consideration 1951, 1952, and 1953, those States would be given this year a great deal more acreage for cotton than they would otherwise be entitled to receive. This temporary adjustment is to be for the sake of those States for this 1 year.

Those are the three main provisions as they relate to cotton. Undoubtedly there will be questions raised with respect to those provisions.

Two subsequent items are covered in the bill, which I desire to mention briefly before returning to the main items of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to report a committee amendment to the bill. The amendment is offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, section 2 also contains a provision which relates to cotton. It is in rather general terms, but is confined to a given area and to cotton only. It relates to a situation where a major flood control reservoir has been constructed. Obviously, it would not be fair to cover by reservoir such a cotton-producing area which had brought a cotton-producing history to the State, and which could be used subsequently for that purpose, and not allow land somewhere else to be utilized for the production of cotton. So section 2 is simply an amendment to the law so as to permit that to be done.

In section 3 there is a complete change in what is covered by section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Whenever, after investigation, it is determined that a substantial difference exists between the usage and the marketing outlets of certain kinds of wheat, the Secretary may authorize expansion of the acreage devoted to such wheat. That is illustrated by the situation with relation to durum wheat.

Durum wheat is produced in three States only, namely, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. But actually the growing of durum wheat is almost entirely confined to the State of North Dakota. The acreage in both Minnesota and South Dakota is small. At present, there is not sufficient durum wheat produced in the United States to take care of the market needs. Manufacturers of macaroni and products of that nature need and require the production of durum wheat. Present limitations are such that not enough durum wheat is being produced, and the price of such wheat is considerably above support limits and the market price of other types of wheat.

We would be placing ourselves in a ridiculous position if, when there is already a scarcity of durum wheat, we should continue to clamp down on durum-wheat acreage and impose restrictions that would make it impossible to grow even the small quantity now produced.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from New Mexico has made a very fine statement for the wheat amendment. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to insert in the RECORD several telegrams and communications I have received from the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union, and other organizations and individuals on behalf of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I should be very happy to have them placed in the RECORD; and the Senator from North Dakota may make any further statement he wishes to make on the subject. However, I am trying to assure the Senator that the provision I am now discussing

relates to a local situation only, where, without the provision in the bill, we would be restricting the production of a commodity already in short supply. It would not help farm production generally to be doing that sort of thing. By the proposed amendment, we would be making it possible to increase the supply.

Mr. YOUNG. There is presently only a 40-percent supply of durum on hand to meet the requirements of macaroni makers.

At present, durum wheat is selling for about \$4 a bushel, or double the amount good spring wheat is bringing. That is due almost entirely to a bad rust situation. Our present varieties of durum wheat are no longer resistant to a new type of rust known as 15B, and until we can find a new variety of rust-resistant durum, we shall have a hard time producing enough durum wheat to meet our domestic requirements. I think it would be most unfortunate to reduce the acreage of durum wheat now, when we ought to be increasing it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the material submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The material is as follows:

AMBER MILLING DIVISION,
FARMERS UNION GRAIN
TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,

St. Paul, Minn., December 24, 1953.

To: M. W. Thatcher.

Re 1954 durum acreage.

The present durum supply is so inadequate it is necessary for the durum mills to grind a mixture of 50-percent durum and 50-percent hard wheats.

In spite of the short durum supply in the United States and in other countries, under present law a further reduction in acreage will be forced in our North Dakota durum territory. We believe such a decrease in acreage is against the public interest, as well as against the interest of the durum producer. It is desirable to have a 1954 durum acreage of at least 3 million to 3,500,000 acres. To get this acreage, the present law must be amended. We believe this objective can be best reached by removing entirely restrictions on the acreage of durum in the main producing counties of Pembina, Cavalier, Towner, Rolette, Bottineau, Walsh, Ramsey, Benson, Pierce, Wells, Eddy, Foster, Nelson, Ransom, and Sargent, all in the State of North Dakota.

If this cannot be done, then each durum grower's allotment should be set at the highest acreage of durum wheat he planted in any one of the last 5 years, with the allotment in no case to be less than his 1953 durum acreage.

If neither of the above methods of relief can be put into effect, then each durum grower should have as his allotment his full average durum wheat acreage, but in no case should his allotment be less than his 1953 acreage.

If restrictions are not removed on durum acreage in the above mentioned counties, the durum acreage will probably be greatly reduced and that of hard wheat increased, because hard wheat is regarded as a surer crop. Hard wheat is in plentiful supply.

Any increase in durum acreage will result in a corresponding reduction in the acreage of hard wheat, barley and flax, all of which are in plentiful supply.

We believe that the removal of restrictions on durum will not result in a burdensome supply of durum, for the following reasons:

1. Without restrictions, the acreage of durum wheat has exceeded 3,500,000 acres only once in the last 15 years and then only slightly.

2. Durum is particularly susceptible to 15-B stem rust because of its longer growing season; therefore, many growers will not plant durum.

3. Durum wheat planted on summer fallow, especially fertilized summer fallow, has been hardest hit by rust. In 1954 more durum will be seeded on second year and unfertilized land, which will result in low yields unless the season is exceptionally favorable.

4. By the time another durum crop is harvested, the pipelines will be empty both as to durum and durum products.

5. There has been a steady increase in consumption of macaroni products made from durum wheat, both per capita, and in total tonnage.

6. There should be an export demand for at least 5 to 10 million bushels. Canada, in the past, has been the major supplier to the export market. The Canadian acreage has declined year after year, mainly because durum does not command a premium there.

7. There is a short world supply of durum. The Swiss Government recently issued regulations requiring the mixing of hard wheat with durum ground, to conserve their durum supplies.

Other wheats do not produce macaroni with quality equal to that made from durum. Even macaroni made from the 50-50 blend, while the best available, is of unsatisfactory quality. The short supply of durum has resulted in very high prices, and the cost of macaroni to the consumer is the highest in history. The public, therefore, is forced to pay high prices for food of unsatisfactory quality. This condition can be corrected only by an adequate supply of durum wheat.

Attached hereto are durum acreage and production statistics since 1940.

Yours very truly,

D. J. COOK.
JULE WAFER.

	Production	Harvested acres
	Millions of bushels	Thousands
1935-39 average.....	26.3	2,601
1940.....	32.3	3,029
1941.....	40.7	2,524
1942.....	41.3	2,109
1943.....	33.5	2,078
1944.....	29.7	2,057
1945.....	32.8	2,004
1946.....	35.8	2,453
1947.....	44.3	2,948
1948.....	44.7	3,187
1949.....	38.8	3,525
1950.....	37.2	2,829
1951.....	34.8	2,518
1952.....	21.4	2,153
1953.....	13.4	1,865

DURUM USE

Mill grind, 24 to 26 million bushels; cereal and other uses, 1 to 2 million bushels; seed, 3½ to 4 million bushels; export, 5 to 10 million bushels; total, 33½ to 42 million bushels.

PRICE SUPPORTS—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Since our 1953 platform was approved in November 1952, there have been no efforts made to introduce the factor of quality into the support program, to make realistic reductions in production of basics or to take any other realistic steps to put the support program in a sounder position.

Therefore we urge Congress to enact extension of the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, providing for a minimum support of 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

We ask that this extension be for a period suitable in length to enable proper reduction of national wheat acreages and of other basic acreages where surpluses exist.

We will accept marketing quotas and acreage restrictions to accomplish this goal of matching production with demand.

With shrinkage of the present wheat surplus we ask Congress and the industry to work toward our common goal of full 100 percent of parity income in the marketplace.

In view of the present short supply of good amber durum for milling purposes, and the necessity of increasing that supply in order that the industry may continue to manufacture high quality durum wheat products such as the American consuming public demands. We, the members of the Towner County Crop Improvement Association, do propose that wheat acreage allotments for 1954 be increased by 30 percent for any durum grower who can produce evidence of having marketed amber durum during each of the past 3 years and will seed at least 70 percent of his wheat acres to amber durum in 1954.

TOWNER COUNTY CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
R. E. PILE, President.

DURUM WHEAT—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Our own industry, particular to North Dakota, in which we supply the macaroni industry with durum wheat, is in serious trouble due to a combination of rust and drought.

The trouble arises from an inability to supply the demand and this can result in a halt in the growth of macaroni consumption by the United States public. Efforts by the industry to use substitutes have failed.

Therefore we ask for prompt legislation by Congress to permit any farmer (with a previous durum history in 1951, 1952, or 1953) who plants 40 percent of his 1954 allotted wheat acres to durum, to be permitted to seed to durum additional acres to bring his total wheat and durum acres up to his total farm wheat base acreage.

This formula will apply to the 1954 crop year only and does not apply to red durum.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 8, 1954.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request your support amendment to cotton quota bill to include durum wheat which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to exclude durum from acreage allotment. Present extreme shortage durum wheat harms consumers, processors, and producers. Acute durum wheat shortage certain to prevail for many years even without acreage restrictions.

F. PEAVEY HEFFELFINGER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 6, 1954.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The durum wheat industry is in a critical condition because of destructive stem rust epidemics during 3 of the last 4 crop seasons. Normal annual durum grind for domestic consumption in the United States requires 25 million bushels. My recent survey indicates less than 10 million bushels millable durum available after deducting 1954 seed requirements, purchases by puffers and other users. Macaroni products now made from durum wheat are an economical and important part of our national diet. Durum wheat is a specialized crop grown to produce a high quality specific product. Durum never should have been included with other wheats under the acreage allotment program for it is used for another purpose and does not compete with them on the market. In addition it is in short supply and apt to remain in that condition for some time, even if acreages of former growers were unrestricted. The reason is the lack of resistant varieties of

durum to race 15B of stem rust. Consumers, processors, and producers are seriously affected by the present situation. We urge that you speed action to correct acreage allotment restriction on durum production in present durum area.

DONALD FLETCHER,
Secretary, Rust Prevention Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 6, 1954.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Durum is a specialty crop. The 1953 crop of 13 million bushels is not half enough to provide the consumers demand for macaroni products. There will be no carryover in 1954. The removal of durum acreage restriction for durum growers should help to increase the 1954 durum supplies.

HENRY O. PUTNAM,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Crop Improvement Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 6, 1954.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently need larger amounts durum wheat for milling for macaroni trade. Prior advent durum wheat into U. S. A. nearly all macaroni products were imported. Now domestic macaroni sales exceed \$197 million annually. Must have durum wheat to protect this business. Urge no restrictions planting durum wheat by farmers with historical record of durum growing in prior years.

H. H. KING FLOUR MILLS, INC.

ST. PAUL, MINN., January 5, 1954.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Endorse your effort secure durum exemption from acreage allotments provided confined to farms having recent durum acreage history and limited to average acreage on those farms seeded to durum since 1950. Closing market today No. 2 durum 58 to 59 pounds, 11 percent protein, \$3.74. If heavy No. 1 amber durum available it would bring \$4, and several cars 1952 durum have sold for over \$4 during December. Production of 14 million bushels this year satisfies only 40 percent of present domestic demand. Durum acreage has receded for several years with result that 1953 seeded acreage at average yield 15 bushels would not have met demand. Adulteration of semolina flour with Farina has resulted distinctly inferior product. Strongly urge regulations be tailored permit North Dakota to produce requirements for this unique and easily identifiable wheat.

J. W. HAW.

PALATINE, ILL., January 6, 1954.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni manufacturers and durum millers urge every consideration be given relaxation of wheat quotas on durum which is in very short supply. Your cooperation with Agriculture Committee will be most appreciated.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., January 7, 1954.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that

amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni and noodles for the manufacture of high-quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Because 90 percent of all milling durum production is in the "durum triangle" of North Dakota, our industry and the macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that territory for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum wheat acreage in the durum triangle of North Dakota should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge, in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors, that you seek exclusion of durum wheat from acreage allotment restrictions in the durum territory.

JULE M. WABER,

Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers' National Federation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with the Senator from North Dakota. For that reason, although the committee tried to restrict the bill and to make it an emergency measure affecting cotton, we felt this matter ought to be dealt with now, so that the farmers, in planning their spring plantings, could make sure of large plantings of durum wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is true, even with the acreage of 21,315,000 acres which will be allowed under the bill, that it will result in the withdrawal from cultivation of about 4 million acres presently devoted to the production of cotton?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it will result in a reduction of about four or five million acres now planted in cotton. If the experience of the 1949 law can be used as a guide, it might result in a still further reduction in acreage. That is impossible to predict. However, Congress passed a law in 1949, and then subsequently amended it in 1950 to cover hardship cases. The hardship amendment would have permitted about 21,708,000 acres of cotton. I do not exactly guarantee that figure, but it is close. There was a planting of 21,600,000 acres of cotton. Actually, the farmers harvested only about 18 million acres of cotton, because of a great deal of so-called cutting back of cotton quotas, after several years when cotton had not been under quotas.

We do not have exactly the same situation at present, but we have very much the same situation. This allotment of 21,370,000 acres could result in the planting of perhaps only nineteen or twenty million acres of cotton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may ask a further question of the Senator, are any restrictions placed in the bill on the uses to which the land thus withdrawn from the production of cotton will be devoted?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. There has been a great deal of discussion on that point, and suggestions have been made

that a law should be passed strictly providing for the disposition of this acreage. That comes under the head of permanent legislation, and we would have been here a very long time if we had tried to enact such legislation.

A very fine farm organization, with which the Senator is familiar, has recommended that all acres diverted from the production of crops, such as wheat, corn, and cotton, that may be taken out of production because of acreage limitations, should not be allowed to be put into certain other types of crops, such as soybeans, in which the Senator's State is very much interested. That farm organization has recommended that those acres be used to restore fertility to the soil; that the farmer be required to plant crops which will increase the fertility of the land and then plow those crops under. However, it would be a very drastic remedy to be prescribed until we can ascertain what it will mean State by State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not possible that in improving the condition of the cotton farmers by restriction of the acreage, with a consequent higher unit price than would otherwise be obtained, and a total higher gross income, nevertheless, by diverting acreage to other crops we would worsen conditions in other sections of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the able Senator from Illinois that that always is a consideration which is present in these limitation-of-acreage bills. I will say, however, that when acreage limitations were put into effect in 1950 they did not result in the dislocation of all or any large segments of American agriculture.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same reasoning would apply to wheat or corn, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same question was not raised when the wheat bills were under discussion. The Senator did not raise the question then.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say that in the case of wheat and corn we had in mind the fact that a great deal of pasture land in States such as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa had been ripped up during the war. The wheat and corn bills gave the farmers opportunity to put that land back into pasture. It is a fine soil conservation practice, but to encourage it is one thing and to require it is quite something else. Many times, while it is encouraged, there is no requirement to do it by proper legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I was not proposing any provision as to cotton which should not apply to other crops, but this is the first of the farm bills we are to consider, and we are going to have the same problem in connection with future farm bills, namely, what is to be done with the acreage which will be withdrawn from cultivation in supporting crops on which marketing quotas and acreage restrictions have been imposed? It seems to me it is important to settle this question

from the beginning, rather than to make no limitations on certain crops, or to introduce a system for corn and wheat which is different from the system in the bills which provide for cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say, in reply, that we are all desirous of enacting appropriate temporary legislation which deals with the farm problem, but I do not think it is possible to answer, and I think we will get into serious trouble if we try to answer every one of these questions immediately and try to handle the complete farm program as a whole.

When the wheat acreage bill comes up, I shall be in favor of giving some temporary relief. I introduced some bills on the subject, and pointed out that it was not necessary to plant or harvest a single kernel of wheat in 1954 to take care of our domestic needs. The same thought applies to cotton and other crops. I am very much in favor of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry trying to work out a permanent program for handling acres diverted from excess crops, but I do not think the enactment of temporary legislation is the way to handle it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I may reply to the Senator from Illinois, he said we should adopt the proposed program as a beginning. This is not the beginning. We have passed a wheat bill which provided for acreage reduction, and under which acres diverted from wheat are already planted to oats, rye, barley, and other grain crops.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that in my opinion the question of dealing with diverted acreages is one of the most serious problems of the entire farm program, so serious that in the President's message on agriculture yesterday he called special attention to it, and indicated what the 25 million acres diverted this year from cotton and wheat should be planted to. I noticed that the President estimated that 3 million acres could be planted to soy beans, which would have a very definite effect on the State of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very much so. Soy beans are an important crop in Illinois and we will be injured if erstwhile cotton acreage is turned to soy beans.

Mr. AIKEN. The acreage diverted from wheat undoubtedly will be planted to oats, barley, and a good many other similar crops, which will nullify the effect of acreage allotments on corn.

The situation is such that if we are to continue the practice of controlling acreage which can be planted to certain crops, we most certainly will have to find some means of controlling the acreage taken out of such crop production.

As the Senator from New Mexico has said, we would be engaged in discussion for a long time if we undertook to do that through a temporary relief measure; and the pending bill is a relief measure. The Senator from New

Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], as many of our colleagues know, comprise the subcommittee which has been working on the cotton-acreage problem for the last 8 or 9 months. They did not get anywhere with its last summer, and, as Senators recall, after Congress adjourned the rains came and several million more bales of cotton were produced than we expected there would be when Congress adjourned in August. The Senators from the other cotton-growing States, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], although he was not a member of the committee, have all worked diligently in an attempt to agree on as fair a bill as possible. No one claims the pending bill is a perfect measure. Any Senator from a cotton-growing State can find something to object to in it. He can probably point out something in the bill that is unfair to his State. But time is of the essence. What would result under the bill as a whole would be much better for the cotton growers than the situation was before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and others undertook to do something about it.

In the main, the pending measure is a 1-year bill, and I hope it may be passed in such shape that it can become law and afford genuine relief to the hundreds of thousands of small cotton farmers in all the States where cotton is produced.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am happy he mentioned the very hard work done by both the senior and junior Senators from Mississippi, the Senator from Florida, the Senator from California, and the Senators from Texas. All these Senators have been trying hard to prepare a measure which can be passed and which will afford a degree of assistance at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the difficulties under which the committee has been working, and I, too, am grateful for their energy and devotion in seeking to meet the situation. But the question as to what should be done with the acreage taken out of cultivation is an extremely important one.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, if the Senator will wait a moment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely desire to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois, and to explain something along the line of his question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that if legislation such as that

now proposed is not enacted, there will not only be a reduction to 21,600,000 or 21,700,000 bales, but there will be a reduction to 17,900,000 bales. In that event the Senator from Illinois would be complaining a great deal, I believe, about the diversion of so many acres—many more, I believe, than would be diverted under this particular amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, Mr. President; I wanted to say the same thing a moment ago to the Senator from Illinois. I was looking to the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California; and I was realizing that if the original allocation made by the Secretary of Agriculture had gone into effect, the acreage in California would have dropped from approximately 1,406,000 acres to approximately 700,000; and the acreage in Arizona would have dropped from approximately 660,000 or 630,000 acres to approximately 300,000. Those 700,000 eliminated acres in California and 300,000 eliminated acres in Arizona consist of irrigated land that is extremely productive, could go into the production of other crops; and if that much of a change were made quickly, it would tend to destroy certain other segments of our agricultural economy.

For example, at one time the State of California had to reduce sharply its cotton acreage and go into the production of tomatoes; and as a result, for a long time the Department of Agriculture was purchasing great quantities of tomatoes.

Similarly, there could be an enormous increase in the production of potatoes, as occurred some time ago, and thus cause great difficulty to the potato producers of Maine, Idaho, and many other States.

So the problem is a very large one. We are trying to reduce it a little. However, it would be much worse to proceed in the way the Senator from Illinois suggested as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico is still proceeding?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he will yield to me, let me say that what he and the Senator from South Carolina are saying is, "If we do not pass this bill, conditions will be worse."

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the real question, however, is whether we cannot make this bill better by providing for a better use of the acreage which is taken out from the production of cotton.

I should like to suggest, for consideration at least, that there be included in the bill an amendment to provide that the acreage withdrawn from cultivation shall be devoted to soil-building purposes, whether by the planting of legumes which are nitrogen fixing or by devoting the acreage to pasturage, or by other methods.

I say very frankly that by means of this present measure we shall be establishing a precedent which may very well continue in other agricultural bills. If we withdraw 4 million acres from the production of cotton, and if later other acreages are withdrawn from the production of other crops, and if such withdrawn acreage is devoted to the grow-

ing of vegetables, or soybeans, or other crops, we shall merely be transferring the problem from one group of farmers to another group of farmers.

In view of the fact that the soil of the Nation needs to be built up, what objection is there to providing that the acreage thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-building purposes?

That is the proposal of the President in his farm message of yesterday. I think this would be an excellent time for us to evidence a little cooperation with the administration.

So I offer this amendment as one which is submitted in the hope, at least, that our friends across the aisle will rise to its support.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield further to me—

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois by saying that we had to take into consideration a great many of the small farmers. When we consider the fact that 39,145 farms in South Carolina plant less than 5 acres to cotton, and that in my State only 845 farms plant more than 99 acres to cotton, we realize that if all those farmers are forced to engage in soil-building practices and soil conservation or soil preservation instead of the growing of cotton, we would penalize and hurt very badly a great many of the small farmers.

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield briefly, first, to the Senator from Illinois; and then I shall yield to others of my colleagues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would not object to a classification system which would provide that farms of less than a given number of acres should not be made subject to the amendment I suggest, but that in the case of farms of more than the given acreage the amendment would apply. It seems to me that the proposed amendment embodies a proposal which might well be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for preserving and protecting the cotton acreage in Kansas. I notice that previously 88 acres in Kansas were planted to cotton, and that now we are to be allowed to have 80 acres planted to cotton. I thank the Senator very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, Mr. President, the time may come when cotton will become an important crop in Kansas.

I yield now to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement.

As a result of the allocations which were prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the present law, I believe it is the unanimous opinion of all individuals familiar with conditions in the

States in the Cotton Belt and the Southwest that an emergency situation has been created, and that if the cotton production of those States is to receive any assistance whatsoever from this Congress, it is necessary that Congress pass a law in the nature of an emergency measure, and do so now. I believe it is agreed that we need to pass such a law now.

I do not think any comment need be made regarding the merits or demerits of the suggestion made by the able Senator from Illinois; but if it is true that there is an emergency—and I believe people generally concede that there is one—then we are faced with an emergency piece of proposed legislation which is in the nature of a compromise, and which should not be the vehicle for any such recommendations as those just made by the Senator from Illinois, no matter how potentially meritorious those recommendations may be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to commend very strongly the subcommittee which has worked out this measure in the main, and which is entitled, I believe, to great credit. I should also like to invite the attention of all Senators present, including the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the table on page 3 of the committee report, which shows, with reference to my own State, the highly critical condition now existing, and which must be corrected by early action or else not be corrected at all, because the planting in my State will have to take place within the next 3 or 4 weeks, at the latest.

My colleagues will note that the planting in the State of Florida—and while Florida is not a large factor in the cotton industry, yet, to each individual there who is engaged in producing cotton, it is a very important matter—last year was 71,000 acres, whereas the recent allocation or allotment made by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law allows our State only 33,122 acres, or less than half the acreage planted last year.

If the remedial action proposed to be taken by means of this bill is not taken speedily, so far as we in Florida are concerned, there will be no purpose in taking it at all, because our cotton has to be planted within the next few weeks.

The second point I should like to make—and again, I hope the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is following this discussion—is that in the State of Florida, at least, most of the acreage of cotton is produced by tenant farmers, and it is generally produced on small acreage; frequently 3 or 4 or 5 acres will be the average planting. Both because it is a tenant-farmer operation and because it is such a small operation, it is obvious that any attempt to write on the floor legislation which would force conserva-

tion practices in that kind of situation would be bound to be hurtful, rather than helpful.

I desire to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I join him in the feeling that the permanent legislation which should be enacted must deal with the important question he has mentioned. I felt so last year when we handled the emergency wheat problem, which, by the way, reduced the wheat acreage from 78,500,000 to 62,000,000; and that reduction was so great as to make it of vastly greater consequence than anything that is provided for in the measure now before the Senate.

But it would still seem obvious that without extensive hearings which would take into consideration the differences in soil and in conservation practices and the differences in landowner operations, tenant operations, and the like, it would be impossible to bring forth any sound legislative proposal in these fields.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made a very fine suggestion, in which I join him, with respect to a permanent program. I shall insist, with him, that something be done to make sure that when, under permanent legislation, we reduce an important acreage we shall not aggravate the problems of producers of other products.

Nevertheless, I hope that he will not insist upon any amendment to this bill, because, in the very nature of things, it is an emergency measure which must be passed at once. It could not be passed if it were to have added to it on the floor a poorly considered conservation-practice amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is much needed emergency legislation. In considering this question the committee tried to iron out the features which might stir up too much controversy, in order that, when the measure reached the floor of the Senate, it could be passed. We all realize that it is not perfect by any means.

It will be recalled that on December 15, 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture called for a vote upon acreage control. At that time in South Carolina 98 percent of the cotton farmers voted for it. They did so in the expectation that the Congress would make some adjustments in the legislation which are badly needed by the cotton farmers of my State. The same is true of the cotton farmers of other States.

Senate bill 2643 makes some adjustments, but they fit mainly the irrigation sections of the Western States. Furthermore, they take away a share of the cotton market from the farmers of my State and place it in the hands of giant cotton factories in States where per capita farm income is already among the highest in the Nation.

I went along with this bill in committee in the interest of harmony. However, it must not be considered as a precedent for legislating economic advantage from one area to another.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that of 90,811 farms with cotton allotments in 1950, 39,145 had 5 acres or less. Of 51,666 remaining, only 845 had allotments of 99 acres or more.

Mr. President, I believe it must be agreed that the 13,470 farms on which cotton was grown in California, New Mexico, and Arizona are faced with less drastic hardship from necessary cotton reduction than are the farmers of South Carolina, many of whom are finding it most difficult to keep going financially in the face of the increased prices which farmers must pay for the things they must buy.

There are several changes in the law which are not embodied in Senate bill 2643, but which are badly needed as the law affects the southeastern cotton growers. I shall not offer any amendments at this particular time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD. It is my understanding that they are embodied in House bill 6665, which passed the House of Representatives. They should be included before the pending legislation becomes law.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the various amendments to which I have referred. I do not ask that they be considered at this time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT-TYPE AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 344, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, WHICH SHOULD BE ADDED TO SENATE BILL 2643

SEC. 5. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The proviso in section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and following: "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (e) provides that not to exceed 10 percent of the State acreage allotment (15 percent in Oklahoma) may be set up in a State reserve. The use of this acreage is now limited to making adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms. By adding the words "to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships," to this section, the State committee will then have the additional latitude needed to place acres where they can do the most good. As the law is now written, unless a farm falls in one of the specified categories, it is ineligible to receive help from the State reserve.)

(b) Section 344 (f) (3) is amended by striking out the colon before the word "provided" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardships."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (f) (3) deals with use of the county reserve acreage. The proposed amendment would liberalize the use of such reserves, thereby helping to prevent hardships at the farm level.)

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, and beginning in 1955 and continuing therefrom, of the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, or among farms in administrative areas, the county acreage allotment, or that of administrative areas, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any 1 of the 3 years immediately preceding the year

for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such 3-year period. If the acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county or administrative area, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).

(Explanation: This provision would give county committees the authority to select the method that will more nearly fit local conditions in distributing acreage from the county level to the farm. The law as now written provides that acreage will be distributed to farms on a percentage of cropland factor basis. This provision will allow the county committees, in 1955 and thereafter, to either distribute acreage allotments on either a percentage of cropland factor basis or an individual farm history basis. Senate bill 2643 makes this provision for 1954 only, however, so it is important that provision should be made for such an optional feature on a long-term basis. The individual farm history method of distributing acreage

to the farm level will, in most instances, more nearly fit the needs of the Southeastern States. However, the percentage of cropland factor method more nearly fits the farm pattern in other areas. By giving county committees the authority to select the method of distribution, local requirements will more nearly be met.)

(d) In determining the national acreage allotment for cotton for 1955 and thereafter, the Secretary shall give due consideration to acreage normally underplanted and abandoned.

(Explanation: This provision will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration normal rates of abandonment and underplantings in setting the level of allotment for any particular year. The present law, section 344 (a), states: "The national acreage allotment for cotton shall be that acreage, based upon the national average yield per acre of cotton for the 5 years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, required to make available from such crop an amount of cotton equal to the national marketing quota." Section 342 states that the national marketing quota shall not be less than 10 million bales or 1 million bales less than the estimated do-

mestic consumption plus exports, whichever is smaller. For 1954, the marketing quota would therefore be 10 million bales. The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was 3.7 percent. In 1950, the last year of allotments, underplantings amounted to nearly 15 percent. Had the Secretary been able to take these facts into consideration, he could have set a national allotment in the neighborhood of 19½ or 20 million acres. The Solicitor ruled, however, that the Secretary did not have the authority to take these facts into consideration.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing allocation of State acreage allotments for cotton under the provisions of Senate bill 2643. This table is a corrected copy of the table contained in the committee report, which failed to show Nevada's full allotment of 2,289 acres with the error of 289 acres being distributed to other States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage ¹	1953 acreage in cultivation July 1	1954 State acreage allotments 17,910,448	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres ²	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average ³		State acreage added by reason of 66 percent provision ⁴	State acreage added by reason of 15 percent provision	Proposed State acreage allotments
					157,500	157,500			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>	<i>Acre</i>
Alabama.....	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,690	10,711				1,346,401
Arizona.....	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958		39,362	36,495		413,815
Arkansas.....	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,693				1,847,036
California.....	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220		95,298	22,879		936,397
Florida.....	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,837	311			4,968	44,116
Georgia.....	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458				1,188,894
Illinois.....	2,750	2,400	⁵ 4,000	⁵ 4,000					⁵ 4,000
Kansas.....	35		⁵ 80	⁵ 80					⁵ 80
Kentucky.....	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86				10,799
Louisiana.....	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466	5,970				750,436
Mississippi.....	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,063,288	16,545				2,079,833
Missouri.....	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681				462,617
Nevada.....	1,950	2,000	⁵ 2,289	⁵ 2,289					2,289
New Mexico.....	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102		22,840			218,942
North Carolina.....	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,860	4,971				624,831
Oklahoma.....	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547	8,736				1,098,283
South Carolina.....	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,640	7,390				929,030
Tennessee.....	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268	5,415				680,683
Texas.....	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361				8,719,178
Virginia.....	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172				21,682
United States.....	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

¹ Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.

² Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in col. (3).

³ 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base one to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.

⁴ Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

⁵ Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Prepared by: Cotton Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join in what the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has just said. This is an emergency bill. It should not and will not establish a precedent for the legislation of economic advantage from one section of the country to the other. I believe that the South—and I am frank to say that that is where my main interest lies—would receive a considerable advantage from this bill.

In the State of Mississippi there are 18 counties which did not have a sufficient cotton allotment to give the little 5-acre farmer the minimum allotment to which he was entitled. In 50 counties in the State of Mississippi there were a great many farmers whose cotton acreage was reduced 50, 60, 70, 80,

or 90 percent. I know of one man, at one time editor of a farm publication, who in 1953 had 300 measured acres in cotton. His acreage allotment for 1954 was 40 acres. There are thousands of instances in the State similar to the case of a man at Utica, Miss., who had 280 acres in cotton last year, and received an acreage allotment of 67 acres for the next year. He would have to turn his tenants out. They have a right to make a living.

The purpose of the pending bill is fundamentally to remove such hardships and inequities, so that people can make a living in the production of cotton. The bill provides that the acreage shall go to the State on the basis of cotton producing history, and that the State committee shall have the first call on that

acreage, to build up to 65 percent each farmer who has been reduced below that figure for the past 3 years of his average planting. I think it is a very wholesome measure.

In Mississippi we will get approximately 320,000 acres. It will require 150,000 acres to build up the allotments of farmers whose allotments have been reduced, to 65 percent of the average of their past 3 years planting.

Under the terms of the amendment submitted by my colleague [Mr. STENNIS] and myself, the next call on each State's additional acreage will be used to build up to 5 acres the allotment of the 5-acre farmer who did not secure sufficient acreage to give him the exemption to which the law declared he was entitled. In Mississippi that would

require, roughly, 11,500 acres. In addition, there would be more than 100,000 acres for general distribution to the farmers of the State.

I think the bill would do a great amount of good. It would prevent the bankruptcy of thousands of farmers in the hill area of the State of Mississippi. While I do not go along with the idea of legislating economic advantage from one section of the country to the other, I was willing to support this proposal in order to relieve hardships in the case of thousands of growers in my own State.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Am I correct in understanding the distinguished Senator to say that under the increased allotment provided in the bill it would be possible, in the State of Mississippi, to give the farmers in the State sufficient additional acreage so that they would all have 65 percent of their 3-year average?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator not feel that there should be provision in the bill to do the same for other historic cotton producing States?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a question of what has been learned from history. With respect to the State of Oklahoma, which is so ably represented in part by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, the figures show that last year Oklahoma harvested 993,000 acres of cotton. In 1954 Oklahoma gets an allotment of 1,098,000 acres of cotton.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that, on the one hand, a part of it cannot be used, and, on the other hand, the State would have to have an additional allotment of approximately 25,000 acres over and above what it will receive under the terms of the bill, in order for the same situation to prevail in Oklahoma as my good friend has indicated will prevail in his State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know the facts about Oklahoma; but I know that if there is an allotment, it can certainly be used. Oklahoma secures an allotment roughly 100,000 acres greater than the acreage on which it harvested cotton last year.

Mr. KERR. Of course the Senator is aware of the terrific drought in Oklahoma in 1953, which prevented the harvesting of many acres of cotton which had been allotted and planted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I know about the drought. I also know there was a drought in Mississippi, and I believe there was a drought in most of the other Southern States. The point is, even though they all suffered droughts, all of them have taken terrific reductions. Nevertheless the Senator's State gets an increase of 100,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. I desire to express my appreciation to my good friend from Mississippi for his statement. I am happy that the great State of Mississippi is faring as well as it is under the bill, because I would be just as much interested in the State of Mississippi as I am in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly we are also interested in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. However, I have the feeling that there is just as much reason why the bill should contain a provision which would permit the farmers of Oklahoma to have the two-thirds of the 3-year average, as there is for the other States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Every State has earned its allotment on the basis of history. Every Southern State stands on the same footing. Mississippi earned its acreage by planting it.

Mr. KERR. I am not objecting to Mississippi's allotment. I am merely asking that Oklahoma be as well off as is Mississippi, on the basis of the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. Historically that is the case.

Mr. KERR. It might appear so from what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has stated and believes to be the fact. However, from the standpoint of the individual allotments which have been made to the farmers and which will be followed under the bill if enacted into law, it does not work out that way.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are three States which certainly should have no complaint under the bill. One of the States is Oklahoma. Another is Arkansas, which last year harvested 1,849,000 acres of cotton. Under the pending bill Arkansas would be allotted 1,847,000 acres, which is a reduction of 2,000 acres. The remaining State is Missouri, which last year harvested 494,000 acres. In 1954 it would get an allotment of 462,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Mississippi taking the position that the allotment for this year is based solely upon the amount of acreage the farmers were able to harvest in 1953?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am not taking that position. It is based on history. It is based on what the States earned under the formula contained in the pending bill. There is one exception. It is the provision that no State shall be reduced more than 34 percent.

Mr. KERR. I understand. However, there is a further provision contained in the bill which, as I understand, would give to the individual farmer an amount equal to two-thirds of his 3-year average.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; if the acreage for the State will justify it; that is, if the State has earned sufficient acreage to justify its being done. In such a case the gadget is effective.

Mr. KERR. My good friend from Mississippi bases his statement on the record of 1953, which was adversely affected by one of the worst droughts Oklahoma has experienced, instead of the 3-year average, which is the basis of the allocation to the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Oklahoma is entitled to more acreage under the formula, Mississippi is also entitled to more acreage, as is Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I shall offer an amendment which will give additional acreage to Mississippi and Oklahoma and Georgia and Alabama.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator does so, it will probably result in a veto of the bill. When we were meeting with representatives of the Department of Agriculture we were given to understand that the proposed agreement is one which the administration will approve.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's point of view, but so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, he shall try to have enacted a bill which will take care of the situation in Oklahoma, even though the bill may be vetoed by both California and the White House.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know anything about that; but I do know that Oklahoma fares as well under this bill as does any other southern State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to point out the fact that on July 1, 1953, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is the only authority we have on the subject, Oklahoma had 1,158,000 acres of cotton in cultivation. Under this bill it gets 1,098,283 acres. Perhaps that is not as much acreage as Oklahoma would like to have, but it is fair and reasonable on the basis of what all the other States had.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas would like to associate himself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the committee on the bill which they have brought to the Senate. At the same time I wish to state, as has been stated by the Senators from South Carolina and Mississippi, that there are some provisions in the bill which we in Texas do not like. We hope the conference committee can make some improvements in it relating to the distribution within States and counties. However, because it is an emergency measure, and because of the fact that it has added to the total allotment in our State approximately 1,300,000 acres, I believe it to be in the best interest of the Senate to enact the bill and then permit the matters in disagreement to be worked out in conference. The junior Senator from Texas will support the pending legislation, and he congratulates the committee on the fine work it has done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that I had hoped to mention the concluding sections of the bills and then to have statements by other Senators follow. It is difficult to yield back and forth during a discussion of the bill. However, I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on one statement made by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. According to the report of the committee, on July 1 the acreage planted in Arkansas during 1953 was

2,112,000 acres. Under the bill the allotment to Arkansas would be 1,847,000 acres.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but Arkansas harvested 1,849,000 acres; as did Oklahoma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] said with reference to our having suffered the misfortune of a severe drought. The Senator from Mississippi and other Senators have apparently made special dispensation for the benefit of the Far West. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico what the justification for it is. What is the justification for the two different gadgets in the bill, giving added acreage to his own State and to his neighbors, Arizona and California. In other words, why is not the bill based on the history of cotton production in all the States? Why did not the committee merely provide that the acreage which has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture as being permitted—and there is some difference of opinion as to the interpretation—is hereby raised to 21 million acres, and the distribution would be followed upon the basis of history?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can give only my own answer to the Senator's question, and I shall not presume to speak for the States of Arizona and California. If the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to take Public Law 272, which was Senate bill 1962, as introduced by me in the Senate in 1949, and which became the law of the land, and will follow its provisions exactly in the 1954 growing season, I would support him, and so would the farmers in my State. It would mean a reduction in the production of cotton this year by approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ million bales, and would give an opportunity for quotas to be taken off by the end of 1955, and possibly by the end of 1954.

A strict application of that law would very substantially reduce the amount of cotton produced in a single year. The Western States expand very rapidly in their cotton production, because they have a very easy way of producing it. They have good, flat, level land and are able to use cottonpickers and four-row cultivators and many other devices, so that the acreage expands rapidly in those areas.

But it was felt that the reduction was too great. The Secretary of Agriculture went to the conference of southern Governors and said he would recommend that the national acreage be increased to approximately 21 million acres. We felt that a bill which took a recognition of the factor of growth in those western areas was not an improper bill. The original bill, introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] provided that no cut should be more than 25 percent. That matter went to a conference of cotton-producing States and an attempt was made to reach a compromise. It was not agreed to at Fort Worth, and it went before a meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, where a compromise was suggested that no cut would be more than $27\frac{1}{2}$ percent. All but two States seemed well satisfied with the maximum of $27\frac{1}{2}$ percent.

The percentage mentioned did not apply to New Mexico because it has reduced its acreage as the Secretary requested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All the other States did that.

Mr. ANDERSON. There were efforts made to compromise it again, and a figure of $29\frac{1}{2}$ percent was suggested. That was provided, I believe, in the House bill. The maximum cut that could be made in any State was $29\frac{1}{2}$ percent. Here the maximum cut is 34 percent, which we thought was a very reasonable and fair adjustment of the situation.

All I say is that if the proposed legislation should be killed, no State would be allowed to produce more than the amount of cotton which is required to make 10 million bales. I think approximately 17 million acres is more than sufficient to produce 10 million bales. I have never questioned it, but if the national acreage were cut down to 17,910,000 acres only for 1954, my State would be highly pleased.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator apparently did not understand me. I was not making the point that it should not be 21 million acres, although I think there is doubt that that much is required. I am asking why California and Arizona are given special consideration. They are given a far greater participation than are the other States. I understood the Senator to intimate a moment ago that there were some special factors making it difficult to reduce acreage in California. I want the Senator to explain why. I do not understand why it is more difficult for California to reduce acreage than it is for Arkansas and Mississippi to reduce acreage.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are getting into questions that I did not think we would get into.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New Mexico is the most knowledgeable man with reference to agriculture in the Senate. If he cannot answer my question, no one else can.

Mr. ANDERSON. A piece of land in California on which water has not previously been put can be irrigated so that cotton can be grown upon it. Cotton can be grown with an expenditure of $2\frac{1}{2}$ acre-feet of water, whereas alfalfa may require 3 or 4 acre-feet of water. To cultivate alfalfa instead of cotton it is necessary to redesign the pumps, change the capacity of the concrete ditches, and change the rapidity with which the water flows across the land. The cultivation of alfalfa is entirely different from the cultivation of cotton.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With reference to cotton, the expenditures are made on a basis wholly different from those made in connection with some other crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. The situation in irrigated areas is wholly different from that in the rain belt. The question of the size of the pump is involved, where it should be installed, and how rapidly the water should flow down the ditches and onto the land. So it is a much more expensive proposition. It requires a very greatly increased initial investment. In the opinion of the farmers, it is a very hazardous thing. One of the

reasons why I think the western farmers are entitled to special consideration is that if cotton quotas had been proclaimed for 1953 as the supply situation seemed to require, many of these investments would not have been made. They were made, and it is pretty serious to impair them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. As soon as I have concluded with the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That brings up a question which I think the Senate ought to know about. There is an implication from the Senator's remarks that there is hardship on the farmers, as he calls them. Is it not a fact that the largest operators in California and Arizona are not farmers in the sense of farmers in my State, but are huge corporations? Is it not a fact that a special tax dispensation was given to those corporations for the very purpose for which we are now proposing to reimburse them with extra acreage? Were they not given special tax dispensations, and is it not a fact that the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., have certificates of \$15,791,000 for the purpose of recompensing them for at least a part of the expenditures which the Senator has mentioned? Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the record, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not familiar with the situation except to the extent that I have been on the ranch in California which was purchased by the Anderson, Clayton & Co. I do not know anything about the tax amortization. The only tax amortization which they could get would be for the construction of gins or compresses to take care of the cotton production of all California farms, not only their own.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell me how many acres the Anderson-Clayton Co. and its subsidiaries have?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I cannot. At one time I saw a news story in California identifying me as a partner of Will Clayton. I am deeply regretful that that rumor is not correct. I do not know anything about their income. I only wish I had half of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not see the statement to which the Senator has referred, but I certainly had no intention of leaving any such impression. I have in my hand data which I believe to be correct and which I shall offer for the record a little later on, showing that there was not a single tax dispensation made in any State east of the Mississippi River; at least, not in my State. The only States given such special treatment were Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Texas. The certification was for a total amount of more than \$30 million.

I am not making an attack on New Mexico. All I am trying to bring out is the fact that there is no reason to give special treatment to California and Arizona, which are the principal beneficiaries of this bill. I am not complain-

ing about the 21 million acres. I see no justification at all for the special treatment. They were given special tax treatment for added expenditures they made. Not only were they compensated in that way, but we all know they have had extremely profitable operations during the past 3 years. We have only to look at the Anderson-Clayton stock on the stock exchange to see how it has gyrated.

In the State of California there are only 8,000 farmers who produce cotton, as compared with 100,000 in the State of Arkansas. Yet, as the figures clearly indicate, \$30 million dispensations, \$30 million tax certificates, were issued, and \$15,791,000 were to this one great corporation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Every nickel of that is for amortization on cotton gins and cotton processing, and has nothing to do with the business of farming. Not a nickel of it went to a farmer in the State of California.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think farmers in the Arkansas delta would not agree that cotton ginning has nothing to do with cotton farming. I think the Senate ought to be told how many acres in the States receiving special consideration are going to the large corporations, because Congress legislates not simply for business. It must take into consideration all those who are engaged in this industry. If it is only a question of the amount of cotton which should be grown, I suppose we ought to abolish all the poor farmers in the South. But that has not been the purpose of such legislation in the past. I do not see any justification for the special acreage allotment to the 3 Western States which are involved in 2 of the gadgets in the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I to understand the theory of the Senator from Arkansas to be that the normal economic development which has taken place in various areas of the country should be interfered with by Government action?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, indeed. The Senator from California completely misunderstands my point. My point is that a bill was agreed to by the people of the Senator's State and the people of other States, setting up a formula for the allocation of cotton planting. That was done in 1950, and it is proposed to do it again, but now it is desired to change the formula. I see no reason why it is necessary to change the formula. We have already had interference with normal cotton growing under the provisions of the old bill. All I am complaining about is that in so-called emergency legislation, which we have before us so suddenly, it is necessary to proceed to change the formula.

The only fair way to proceed is to use exactly the same basis for allocating acreage, in this case perhaps 21 million acres, as was provided in the previous law, on which our cotton-producing history was built. Now it is proposed to change the basis in so-called emergency

legislation. I can see no justification for special treatment being given to 3 States, especially to 2 of those States. I agree that the State of New Mexico gets a very, very small bite under this proposal. The greater part, of course, goes to Arizona and California. I do not see any reason for it. If there is economic justification, or any other justification, under the basic history of the last 5 years, in due course those States will get the benefits for what they planted in 1953.

What is sought to be done by this bill is to step up the benefits and to give special privilege. I do not see the justification for it. Certainly there is no justification from a humanitarian point of view, the point of view of trying to help people. The principal beneficiaries obviously are huge corporations which have gone into those States, and, because of their tremendous financial capacity, have been able to bring this acreage up from under 600,000 acres in 1950 to 1,400,000 acres. Compare that with the acreage in the other States.

Who is it that is making the largest contribution to the tremendous surplus which is worrying everyone? It is the same States who are the beneficiaries of these special gadgets. I see no reason to grant special privilege to increase acreage for their benefit by the terms of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I presume the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows that the State of California is taking a most substantial cut under the whole plan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not according to the historical basis, but only when we consider the production of last year, which is not the basis of the legislation on which we have been proceeding for several years. In other words, by this bill we are changing the basic rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are not changing a single basic rule. We are altering for 1954 only the pattern, but the basic law will remain the same. That is one thing we are trying to preserve.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the question raised by the Senator from Arkansas, does not the Senator from New Mexico believe it would be a good idea to place in the RECORD at this point the letter addressed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under date of December 14, 1953, setting forth the Secretary's reasons for believing an increase of 3 million acres planted in cotton would be highly desirable?

I may say further that the bill was written as it is because the committee believed that a reduction of more than 34 percent in cotton acreage in 1 year would be injurious to a number of States, and no less injurious to California, New Mexico, and Arizona than it would be to South Carolina, Arkansas, Texas, or any other State.

Speaking of special privilege, I may further point out that there was an area, including virtually all the State of Oklahoma, portions of the Panhandle of Texas, some of Arkansas, and possibly portions of New Mexico, although I do

not believe there was much in New Mexico, where in 1951 there was a heavy abandonment of acreage of winter wheat, and thousands upon thousands of acres abandoned to wheat were planted to cotton. Now we come to a year when we have acreage allocations for both wheat and cotton. Certain areas are privileged to count the same acres twice in figuring their allotments for both wheat and cotton for this year. If we are going to do away with all special privilege, we should take care of such a situation as that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that 34 percent—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, no. The Senator from Vermont has a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Secretary recommend a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the Secretary of Agriculture has not recommended special privileges for anyone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand why the committee has done so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not done so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the justification for the California allocation? I have not yet heard it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has great regard for the economy of the entire country and for the producers of every commodity, wherever they may be located. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that restricting cotton acreage reduction to 34 percent for any one area of the country is wrong?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. California was aware of the law, and agreed to it when it was passed, and California was given special tax dispensation for investments made in facilities there.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arkansas advocate recommitting the bill and letting the law stand as it is? Why does not the Senator move to recommit the bill and let everyone go back to the present law if he likes it so well?

All the Senator needs to do is to move to recommit the bill, and he will have a law already in existence with which he is perfectly well satisfied.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that is an answer to my inquiry with respect to the justification of special acreage. If California is to take that attitude, I think the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to know what reasons motivated the committee to grant this privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont to have printed in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture is granted.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 14, 1953.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: On October 9, pursuant to provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, I am

nounced a national cotton marketing quota of 10 million (500-pound gross weight) bales and a national cotton acreage allotment of 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop. I acted in accordance with the legislative provisions of the act and had no authority to adjust or change the quota level or the acreage allotment specified to produce cotton at the quota level.

On several recent occasions I have expressed my great concern over this severe production adjustment with its attendant hardship on many farmers, and in fact on the whole Cotton Belt economy. I have also publicly indicated that I would urge Congress to make a reasonable increase in the minimum national marketing quota specified in the act for the year 1954, so that the adjustment of cotton supplies could be spread out over 2 or more years instead of attempting to accomplish it within a single year.

The basic work in establishing individual farm cotton acreage allotments has proceeded to the point where it is abundantly clear that the currently announced national acreage allotment will result in grossly inequitable farm acreage allotments in many cases. If the allotments remain unchanged they will create undue hardship for many cotton farmers, as well as other segments of the cotton industry.

An appraisal of the program as developed to date indicates that an additional 3 million acres would make it possible to substantially correct the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments, and to bring such allotments more nearly in line with plantings in recent years. A national allotment of this size, when adjusted for historical under-planting and normal abandonment, could be expected with average harvested yields of the past 5 years to produce about 10.5 million bales of cotton. A crop of this size should result in a material reduction in our cotton stocks. Thus, even with the proposed increase in the national allotment, a good start would be made toward adjusting cotton supplies.

I, therefore, desire to recommend to the Congress that action be taken at the earliest possible date to increase the 1954 cotton acreage allotment to 21 million acres, thus providing latitude for correcting individual farm hardship cases. I also recommend that this additional acreage be apportioned to farms in such a way as to correct substantially the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments.

I have expressed regret that producers had not previously reached agreement on the apportionment of an increase in the national allotment, in order to facilitate the necessary action by Congress. While I have not had an opportunity to examine the proposal, I understand that representatives of major cotton producer groups have now reached general agreement on these questions. This is a very encouraging development and seems to be very much in accord with our thinking on the subject. The Department of Agriculture will support the provisions of such an agreement if it will lessen the hardship of severe acreage reductions, provide an equitable basis for the apportionment of the increased allotment among individual farms, and still provide for a reduction in total cotton supplies.

The Department is gathering detailed information on the currently authorized farm allotments. It expects to be in position by the time Congress reconvenes to recommend specific amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which will carry out the broad policy recommendations made above.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in an effort to attempt to answer some of the questions propounded by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I wish to state, with respect to Arizona, if the matter were left to what the Senator terms large cotton interests—and he has not mentioned all of them—those whom the Senator mentioned are not land owners; they are ginners.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator stating that they own no cotton-producing facilities?

Mr. GOLDWATER. They are not large owners of cotton-producing facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator place in the RECORD the number of acres they control?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not have that information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then how does the Senator know they are not large producers?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am attempting to answer the basic question of the Senator from Arkansas. If it were up to the people who are termed large cotton growers in the State, of whom there are substantial numbers, I agree they would be unanimously in favor of retaining the restriction of 17,900,000 acres, because if they should go through, as they would be able to do this year, with a low amount of cotton planting next year, it would bring a tidal wave of cotton in the Southwestern area, and in the next period of allocation the Southern States, and the Senator's own State, would suffer from it.

This action, of course, was asked and suggested by the Farm Bureau, and agreed to by the Senators and Representatives from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, California, and also Texas, because there are a large number of small planters in new producing areas of those States. Consider, for instance, the southwestern area of Arizona, under the project called the Welton-Mohawk, which came into being only last year. We need 22,000 acres of land available for cultivation this year.

We find in the southeastern section of Arizona, in Cochise County, a similar situation, where the cultivation of cotton has a history of only a year or two. Arizona, California, New Mexico, have had a history of growing cotton that extends back, in any substantial amount, only to about 1950. With the start of the war our country needed more cotton than the South and the State which the Senator from Arkansas is concerned could produce, so the Government went and urged the farmers to the west to increase the planting of cotton.

Our land can produce cotton at remarkably low rates. In Texas it can be produced at 13½ cents a pound, in Arizona at 20 cents, which is substantially lower than it can be produced for elsewhere in the United States.

Eventually, no matter how we may word the law, no matter how much our distinguished friends from the South like it or dislike it, the production of cotton is going to move to the Southwest and the West because of the cheapness of production costs. Likewise, we in the West, who have been producing cattle

are resigned to the fact that ultimately the rich States of the South will produce much of the cattle we have been producing in our section.

I merely desired to explain that this request for a small increase of acreage is on behalf of the little growers in Arizona and California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not have any confusion in his mind as to what the bill would accomplish, and will realize that every dollar of money he is talking about relates to tax-amortization concessions made in order to bring gins and compresses into areas in the West.

The Anderson, Clayton & Co., as I recall the situation on the ranch referred to, grows cotton on about 20,000 acres out of 1,400,000 acres in the State of California. If the cotton acreage should be cut down greatly, as would be done under the existing law, Anderson-Clayton could stand it because it has many other sources of income. But the small farmers would be in trouble. I have met some of the farmers in California in the past few months—supplementing the remarks which the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have made—and I know that if the national quota is left at 10 million bales, as the present law requires, the large corporations that have one or two tracts are not going to worry about it, but the farmers who are in desperate need because they are small operators are going to be in great distress.

I do not believe there is a dollar in that list that the Senator from Arkansas referred to that ever went into the development of cotton acreage. The money that Anderson-Clayton paid was paid for a developed ranch, including 2,000 acres in melons, and that has nothing to do with ginning operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, 58 of the gins of the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and the Western Cotton Oil Co. were, of course, granted accelerated amortization. Of a total of 133 for the States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, 58 were granted to Anderson-Clayton and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., which would indicate they have a very substantial acreage. I have tried to find out what the acreage is, but apparently that is a great secret. In my opinion, the committee ought to be able to tell the Senate just what the situation is.

I am leading up to the point that Senators keep talking about the small farmers in Arizona and California. Of course, there are small farmers in Arkansas, in Georgia, and everywhere else. Does the Senator know what the average acreage is per farmer or per voter in California?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but it is very substantially larger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is about four times as much; is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not try to give the figure, because I do not know it. But I point out that the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] brought out before the committee a few days ago that there were

18 counties in his State in which not a single farmer got more than the allotment. That would be unheard of in the West. In the State of California a man who wanted to operate 5 acres would be committed to an insane asylum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think 35 acres is the average in California, and 44 in Arizona. Senators come before us and base their case on the hardship imposed on various farmers. Of course, conditions are hard on everyone, but relatively how do Senators make a case for any special privileges to a State which has an average of 44 acres per voter as compared with a State with an average of 5 acres, as I believe the figure is in Mississippi? I think it is 12-plus, nearly 13, in Arkansas. That is a third or fourth as many.

If we are to take action based on concern for the individual, we can make a better case. We can ask special privileges in Arkansas. I am only opposing giving special privileges and dispensations to States which need them least of all. Based on the statistics and the figures which I read in the hearings, the last places which really need special privilege are California or Arizona. They have already the largest cotton acreage per person. As we have been told just now by the Senator from Arizona, they can produce cotton very economically. There is some question about that, incidentally. We have to evaluate how much the Federal Government has poured in. I would certainly file a caveat that they cannot produce it cheaper than it is produced in our good delta country, if the special privileges are equalized.

I am not trying to have taken away from the States anything that belongs to them according to the law under which we have been living for the past several years. The only thing I am asking is why they cannot live under the same law. I think they can. I think they are better off today per capita or in any other way; I know they are. I have not heard any justification in fact for a special privilege to these three States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the factors in the consideration given Western States was that if we turn loose a million acres in California and Arizona of higher production land, and throw it into alfalfa, we can calculate pretty well what the alfalfa price will be across the country. If we throw it into potatoes, we know what would happen to the potato producers across this Nation. Large groups discussed this at Fort Worth and Chicago, and what we did was based on our desire to keep Arizona and California from entering into competition with the other States which are producing crops already near a surplus position.

I again wish to say that the whole story of the acreage in California owned by the large corporation would not be very difficult to obtain. Although I do not know the operations of Anderson, Clayton & Co. as well as I should, yet I feel reasonably safe in saying that Anderson, Clayton & Co. do not plant more than 20,000 acres of cotton in any State. In all the States put together, I believe the only large cotton plantation

they have is the one in California; and I believe they bought it to keep that cotton from going to a rival gin.

I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, as a new Senator I should like to tell my colleagues in the Senate how deeply appreciative I am of the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who formed a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in discussing and working on this entire cotton question.

A year ago I introduced a piece of legislation at the request of the cotton growers in California. They were apprehensive that at the next planting the Secretary of Agriculture would announce an allotment which would restrict the acreage in California perhaps by as much as one-half. As a matter of fact, when the acreage allotments were made, the result was a cut of more than one-half in California.

At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the proposed legislation I had introduced, but did not approve it.

Meanwhile, with cotton quotas being put into effect across the entire cotton belt, the Secretary of Agriculture requested emergency legislation at this session. I believe I can tell you, Mr. President, that one of my memories of the time I have spent in the Senate will be that of sitting in a subcommittee, listening to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. EASTLAND] and seeing them write what I am sure constitutes the best type of compromise legislation in a very difficult situation.

I listened to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] state a few moments ago that the cotton acreage in California was controlled by big business. I deny that, Mr. President.

I wish to indicate one figure which I believe will bear somewhat upon the subject. In 1950, when the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed cotton quotas in the United States, 9,684 farms in California were given allotments. One thousand, two hundred and seventy-seven farms of that number represented allotments to cotton farms of 5 acres or less.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from California tell the Senate how many acres Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiaries farm and control in California?

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret to state to the Senator from California that I do not have that particular statistic; but if he deems it relevant, I shall be glad to obtain it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do think it is relevant. I tried to obtain it from the Department of Agriculture, but no one there could supply it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say that I do not believe it is a figure with which the Department of Agriculture concerns itself. The Department does not go around inquiring about the ownership of tracts of land.

But I believe that the Anderson-Clayton firm owns and controls approximately 38,000 acres of land of all kinds in California. Approximately 20,000 acres of it go into the production of cotton; about 2,000 acres of it normally go into the production of melons; and the rest in alfalfa. That was the pattern the last time I drove by the farm, and I believe it is the only farm owned by that company.

I have said that I know something of the reason which compelled that company to buy that farm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that include the Western Cotton Oil Co.?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the allotments were made, acreage in California was cut more than one-half. I believe that represents a potential loss to the economy of California of between \$150 million and \$200 million.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, Mr. President; I prefer to conclude my very brief statement. I shall not speak very long.

I am sure it seemed to the subcommittee that it would not be proper to prepare a bill under which some States would suffer, as in the case of Arkansas, approximately 10 percent, whereas other States would suffer a vastly greater amount.

Finally, on the recommendation of the farmers of the United States, the subcommittee recommended that no State should be cut more than 34 percent. And that is what the bill before the Senate provides.

Only two States—namely, Arizona and California—would benefit by that provision. That is another way of saying that no State affected by the proposed legislation with which we deal today would have a cut of more than 34 percent in its cotton economy.

Mr. President, how else can we find a basis upon which to write a fair piece of legislation of this kind? If anyone were to object, if anyone were to offer amendments to this bill, it seems to me it should be either the Senators from Arizona or the Senators from California, the States that are cut 34 percent under this measure. Yet I am glad to say that the Senators from Arizona and the Senators from California are satisfied with what is a fair and just compromise, and will support it as a 1-year emergency stopgap bill. They hope that the amendments which will be offered on the floor will be rejected in their entirety.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at this time for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a moment ago the senior Senator from Oklahoma attempted to ask me a question. I must confess that subsequently

I forgot about it, and yielded to other Senators.

At this time I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question, or I shall be glad to yield the floor, as he may prefer.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question or two.

I should like to say that I am seeking information. I tried to ask the Senator from Arizona a question, but he declined to yield. Then I tried to ask the Senator from California a question, but he declined to yield.

So I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for yielding for a question or two.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. In order that the RECORD may be clear as to the meaning of certain provisions of the bill, I should like to ask some questions relative to the release and reallocation of acreage, both as to the manner and as to the timing.

Beginning in line 20, on page 3 of the bill, we find the following:

(2) Any part of any 1954 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable—

On a certain basis.

Does the Senator from New Mexico believe it is accurate to interpret that provision to mean that such voluntary surrender by one farmer to the county committee may be made at any time up to the end of planting time for that county?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I so interpret it; and I would call his attention to the fact that in 1950 an almost identical hardship provision was written into the bill then pending. Under its terms, several hundred thousand acres of cotton land were temporarily surrendered to the county committees, and were reallocated by the county committees to farms requiring additional acreage. No time limit was specified in the bill then; and for the sake of the legislative intent, let us say that no time limit is specified in this bill. It can be done any time by the individual farmer surrendering the acreage to the county committee; and it may be reallocated by the county committee at any time prior to planting.

Mr. KERR. To other farmers within the county.

Mr. ANDERSON. To other farmers in the county having allotments.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Reading further from page 4, beginning at line 5:

If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he would interpret that

language to mean that the surrender of unused acreage back to the State by the counties, and the reallocation by the State to other counties within the State, would also be without time limit, in the year for which the allocation is made.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that that also is without time limit. A special provision was written into the 1949 act for the State of Oklahoma, because it had an unusual problem. The planting of cotton was shifting from one area of the State to another, as the distinguished Senator well knows. Had this provision been in the law at that time, it would not have been necessary to allow Oklahoma to have a special 15-percent reserve, because counties not using the acreage could have surrendered it, and it could have been used by the other counties. However, at that time this provision had not been thought of, and Oklahoma could not do that. Therefore it was necessary to give Oklahoma special consideration, because of the transfer of cotton production from one end of the State to the other.

It is the intention of this provision to make possible the very thing which was needed in Oklahoma at that time, and which, in my opinion, is needed in Texas now. I do not think the Senators from Texas agree with me completely as to how much could be transferred, but I think a fairly large acreage could be transferred there. No effort is made to establish any time limit whatever.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his answer. I appreciate his tribute to the distinguished former Senator from Oklahoma who, in 1949, was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I must say that in the opinion of the present senior Senator from Oklahoma, if we had a member on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1954, Oklahoma might come as near being a special beneficiary of the act as the senior Senator from Oklahoma thinks California is. I was addressing my questions to the meaning of the proposed legislation in 1954, which, as I understand, is applicable to all the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask one further question in that connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not trying to say that Oklahoma received preferential treatment in 1949. It had a problem, and the Congress tried very hard to meet that problem by providing that Oklahoma might set aside a 15 percent reserve, as against a 10 percent reserve somewhere else, not as something which was preferential, but something which was required by the facts of life within that individual State.

Mr. KERR. As I recall, under that provision Oklahoma did not receive an additional allotment not participated in, on the basis of the historical background, by all other States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Would the Senator's interpretation as to the surrender by farmers within the county for reallocation within the county and also by counties back to the States, followed

by reallocation by the State committee within the State, apply equally to all the cotton acreage allocated to the State, as well as to the additional acreage provided for in this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have my own opinion, and I am reinforced by the legislative counsel for the committee. My opinion is that it applies to all of it.

Mr. KERR. That is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we are in agreement on that point, we have almost fixed the legislative history.

Mr. KERR. I wanted to be sure that the RECORD disclosed that that was the interpretation of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma that that was the intent of the committee.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that answer.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question, which does not relate to information about the bill.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma, in listening to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] a while ago, thought he understood the Senator from Arizona to say that the allocations in this bill were as requested and agreed to by the Farm Bureau Federation. Did the Senator from New Mexico hear that statement by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I heard the statement. I shall not try to interpret it.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. As a matter of fact, many conferences have been held. There was a conference held at Fort Worth, which was sponsored, I believe, by the Farm Bureau Federation. There was a subsequent conference to which, for obvious reasons, I was not invited. It was not held by Farm Bureau groups, but by another group, who were trying to alter some things which some of us had planned. There was a subsequent meeting held in Chicago by the Farm Bureau Federation.

Many persons have tried their best to arrive at a solution for this problem. There was an approval of this particular method by the Farm Bureau Federation. I mention that fact because the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and I had some discussion on the subject, and we arrived at a formula not quite the same as that in the bill. Our formula did not include additional acreage for Arizona and California by limiting reductions to 34 percent. It is interesting to note that it was as a result of efforts by Members from Southern States that the decision to give additional acreage to California and Arizona was written into the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's statement. Does he mean to say that the idea of a special allotment for certain States originated with Members from the Southern States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I say that when the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, and I tried to reach an understanding; it was decided that there would be 21 million acres, plus the hardship allowance of 1½ percent. That decision was transmitted to a meeting in Chicago attended by Farm Bureau representatives from all the cotton-producing States. The States of Arizona and California were greatly outnumbered. The proposal now before the Senate, providing that there shall be no cut greater than 34 percent, came out of that meeting, in which, as I say, a great many Southern States were represented. I therefore feel that they were entirely satisfied with that proposal.

I should like to conclude my discussion with respect to section 4. Does the Senator from Arkansas have any questions as to that section?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to have any misapprehension left in the RECORD. I wish only to say that I do not believe that the cotton producers of my State feel that they agreed to the provision with respect to a special acreage for California. It is not my impression that they feel they agreed. I do not know whether the Senator is saying that in his opinion they agreed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator correct me if my statement is not accurate. I think the decision of the Farm Bureau meeting in Chicago on this subject was unanimous. There was no conflicting opinion when they finally came to the settlement of it. Walter Randolph appeared before our committee as the representative of the Farm Bureau, and he voiced no objection to this provision. In fact, he supported it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He is not from my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He is from Alabama, but he represented all the farm bureau organizations. I did not mean to go into that question. I meant only to say that there were Senators from Southern States on the committee. They tried to solve this problem in what they considered to be an equitable fashion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One point has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas which we have failed to clear up, and which I believe should be cleared up for the record. There is the possibility that his remarks with respect to tax amortization privileges might be construed as applying to the land. I should like to make it clear that they do not apply to the land. Tax amortization certificates have been issued to cotton ginners and oil processors in the West. In the East similar certificates have been issued applying to other phases of agriculture. I did not wish to leave any misapprehension in the RECORD.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentioned special privileges accorded to cotton growers of Arizona, California, and New Mexico. I did not want the tax amortization privileges to

be included among them. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has visited Arizona repeatedly. He is one of the most welcome visitors we have. I am sure he refers to the special privilege our farmers enjoy because of the delightful sunshine, the fine weather, and the pleasant and industrious people who live in that State. I am sure he does not intend at all to allude to any special grants from the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to finish with section 4 of the bill. Section 4 relates to the potato situation. In a joint resolution passed by Congress either in 1949 or 1950 provision was made that unless the potato growers adopted a system of controls they would not be eligible for price supports on potatoes. I must plead guilty to having drawn up the original amendment. It was offered by the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas. It was subsequently supported by many Senators, and I believe the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] finally introduced the successful joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Mexico is mistaken in that regard. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced the joint resolution. He was joined in its introduction by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDERSON. I apologize to the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, provision was made that price supports could not be given to the growers of potatoes. In presenting the joint resolution it was not the intention that the Secretary of Agriculture should not have the right to make use of section 32 funds. We never dreamed that could happen until an interpretation was made by the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the joint resolution forbade the use of section 32 funds. Therefore, the pending bill contains a provision making it possible to use section 32 funds for supporting the price of Irish potatoes.

Mr. KERR and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will recall that we tried to amend the law so as to leave discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary with respect to potatoes; but because of the insistence of the Senators from the potato-growing States that a mandatory provision should be enacted into law, the joint resolution referred to was finally adopted in the present form of the law. We would have readily agreed to discretionary power.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Mexico referred to section 32 funds. Can he tell the Senate how much money is available in that fund?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will be able to tell the Senator in a moment. I believe it is approximately \$400 million.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator also able to refresh our memory as to the percentage of that fund which the law pertaining to it permits the Secretary to use with reference to any commodity which is available to be supported by such funds?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not certain, but I believe it is 25 percent.

Mr. KERR. Then under section 4 of the pending bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to use up to \$100 million in supporting the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that is correct. However, he would be restricted by the provision that he could buy only what he could readily dispose of.

Mr. KERR. Does the section provide how the Secretary of Agriculture may readily dispose of the potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I have the answer to the Senator's previous question. I have before me the Department of Agriculture handbook. It states that under section 32 the amount of money available is \$402,200,000. My answer with respect to 25 percent is correct.

Mr. KERR. The bill contains the provision that in 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use \$100,500,000 to support the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe theoretically he could do so. I do not believe that practically it could be done.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico explain why the Secretary could not do so?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because I do not believe any Secretary of Agriculture would hold that he could buy \$100 million worth of Irish potatoes and dispose of them advantageously.

Mr. KERR. But it would be within his legal authority to do so if the bill became law?

Mr. ANDERSON. If he should follow the criterion set up in the bill, it would be in his power to do so.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico enlighten the Senate as to what part of a cotton-emergency measure section 4 is, inasmuch as it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend \$100 million in 1954 to support the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not a part of the cotton-emergency measure. The Senator is getting onto ground that probably we should not be entering. I suggested in committee the subject should be treated in a separate bill. On the other hand, the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture was obviously contrary to what Congress intended, so I agreed with others to put it in this bill. I firmly believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority now to spend and can spend, up to \$100 million. The Solicitor General does not agree with me. Realizing that he is a lawyer and I am not, I thought it would be de-

sirable to correct the situation in the pending legislation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico admit that the proposed section 4 has nothing whatever to do with the emergency situation with reference to cotton acreage and cotton planting this year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will admit it.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator feel, insofar as germaneness and applicability are concerned, that an amendment to the bill requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of beef cattle on the hoof at 90 percent would be just as much a part of the cotton-emergency bill as is the provision with reference to Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not agree, because I believe in my own heart that Congress never intended to take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the right to use section 32 funds to support the price of Irish potatoes. I believe Congress did not intend to do it, and that the interpretation made by the Department of Agriculture is a little bit on the whimsical side, to say the least. I thought perhaps it was desirable, if the Secretary of Agriculture did not want to do it, to say that he did not have the authority. I believe he does have the authority.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to aline himself with the Senator from New Mexico in acknowledging the possibility of whimsical action on the part of the Department of Agriculture as now constituted. However, I do not believe the Senator understood my question. If he understood it, I do not believe he answered it. I asked him, insofar as the provisions of law are concerned, whether it would not be just as applicable to amend the emergency cotton acreage allotment bill so as to provide mandatory provisions to support the price of beef cattle, as it is to authorize the expenditure of \$100 million now on hand for the support of the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to answer it by saying that a proposal requiring the Secretary of Agriculture in mandatory fashion to support the price of beef cattle at 90 percent of parity in my opinion is quite different from a provision which permits him to do what I believe he already has the power to do.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator admit that such an amendment would be just as much in order as section 4 of the pending bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would be in order; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator permit me to make a brief statement on the background of the potato amendment?

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has asked that he be allowed to yield the floor. I am perfectly willing to yield to other Senators, but I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from New

Mexico would yield to me for two very brief questions, which I believe he can answer immediately. I should like to have the answers for my own information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to yield to other Senators when I have completed my statement.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I were the joint authors of the amendment in its final form which struck out the provision in the then existing law for the support of Irish potatoes.

It was our intention simply to strike out the possibility of any further support-price program as that term is generally recognized—a mandatory price-support program or any other price-support program in the normal usage of the term—and there was no intention whatever to strike Irish potatoes off the list of agricultural commodities or to put them under different treatment from other commodities which are entitled to the use of portions of section 32 funds whenever surpluses should justify that use under other provisions of law.

So, Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] came before the committee, stating that the potato producers of Idaho did have surplus production of potatoes this year which they wanted to have handled under the school-lunch program or some other similar program, and had been confronted with a ruling by a former solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and myself was so broad as to prevent that use, we both felt, and the committee felt, that there was no such reasonable interpretation to be placed upon our amendment, and that by all means Irish potatoes ought to be restored to the list of agricultural commodities and be given the same right which every other agricultural commodity has under the law for the use, if needed, of portions of section 32 funds.

Therefore, this amendment is in the bill. It was simply to place Irish potatoes in the same position as livestock and other agricultural crops. The largest amount of recent use of such funds has been for the livestock industry, and the purpose of this amendment is to permit Irish potatoes to regain and retake their place in the list of agricultural commodities which are entitled to relief through section 32 funds.

As to the amount, every other agricultural commodity stands on the same basis, and there is no more reason for assuming that the full \$100 million, if that is 25 percent of the total, would be used on Irish potatoes than there would be that it is to be used in full on citrus or prunes or raisins or apples or peaches or pears or any of the other numerous commodities where section 32 funds have been used.

The whole result of the amendment would simply be to restore Irish potatoes to their rightful place with reference to the use of section 32 funds in the family of agricultural products, so that they would at least have equal standing in connection with the use of some of the section 32 funds to relieve their distress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield so that the Senator from Oklahoma may ask a question.

Mr. KERR. As I understood the Senator from Florida, he said that section 32 funds were being used for the livestock industry.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator explain what he had reference to, so that I may acquire some information which I do not now have?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that a very substantial amount of those funds had been used with respect to the purchase of canned meat for the direct purpose of assisting the livestock industry. I have in my office a statement of the total amount used. I do not recall the amount at the moment, but it was quite large. My statement was to remind the Senator from Oklahoma, if he had forgotten it, that the livestock industry is already on terms of parity with every other agricultural commodity, insofar as the use of section 32 funds is concerned, with the sole exception of Irish potatoes, and the purpose of the amendment is to restore Irish potatoes to the position from which it should never have been taken.

Mr. KERR. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator that if he is referring to the \$100 million which the Secretary has spent for hamburger meat and canned meat, it has been for the benefit of the packers and not for the benefit of meat producers.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I should like to say that I do not care to enter into any argument with the Senator from Oklahoma as to the result of the investment of section 32 funds. My statement was, and it continues to be, that the largest amount of section 32 funds expended this past year have been in the effort to help the livestock industry in connection with products of the livestock industry, and the result of the amendment in the committee bill relative to Irish potatoes is simply to restore Irish potatoes to a position of equality with livestock and all other agricultural commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I promised to yield very briefly to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to ask some questions in order to be certain in my own mind on some points.

First, if I have correctly read the proposed legislation, the particular acreage provided for would be sufficient to give to every farmer the higher of 2 figures,

or 40 percent of the highest acreage during any one of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, provided the farmer did not exceed 50 percent of the cropland. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a rather difficult question to answer in a brief way. It is correct as to nearly every State. It is not correct as to the State of Texas and the State of Florida.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand Louisiana is short approximately five thousand acres plus.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would my statement be correct so far, as Alabama is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be correct so far as Alabama is concerned and if the figures supplied by the Cotton Production Division are correct. It is just barely correct as to Louisiana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While I was in Alabama during the adjournment of Congress I inquired as to allotments made under the existing law, and I heard many complaints. One farmer came to my office and stated that he had a farm of 160 acres. There were 22 persons living on it. Three acres of the 160 acres were allotted to the home place, the house, barn, and outbuildings. Some 50 acres were in pastureland, and 100 acres in cropland, 90 acres of which were in cotton. Yet he had been assigned 22 acres. Is my understanding correct that he would be allotted 50 percent of the cropland, provided he did not exceed one of the other figures?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he would be given the larger of 65 percent of the 3-year average or 40 percent of his largest planted acreage, but not more than 50 percent of his cropland. The 1954 Alabama allotment would be approximately a total of 1,346,401 acres.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That leads me to the next question. If I understand correctly, from examining the figures, it would make a minimum of 5 acres available to every cotton farmer. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is left to the county committee as to the use to be made of the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But, as a matter of fact, under the old allotment, in my State every county except 12 received 5-acre allotments and those 12 counties could receive such allotments if they wanted to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the State committee has power, in its discretion, to bring an exempt farmer up to his exemption. I understand that only 3,500 acres will be taken in the State of Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator mean 35,000 acres?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; 3,500.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know it is not a large amount, because only a few counties have been left out.

Mr. EASTLAND. Alabama has 12 counties affected; Mississippi has 18 counties affected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. First, I wish to join with other Senators in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to others Senators for their expeditious reporting of the bill. During my visits to the cotton-growing sections of Tennessee during the past summer and fall, no problem was more pressing or about which there was more concern than the allotment of cotton acreage. It was realized by all cotton growers that in order to work out matters for their best interests with regard to planting, the whole question must be settled quickly. The bill will give them a better plan than would be the case if the bill did not pass.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, in connection with the 65-40-50 formula, set forth in the bill, if, according to his records, there would be sufficient to satisfy the farm demands of Tennessee on that basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the final allotment for Tennessee under the bill will be about 680,000 acres. The amount which Tennessee would need to satisfy the 60-40-50 provision would be 664,000 acres. So Tennessee would get roughly 30,000 acres more than would be needed for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield. However, I may first say that I have now been advised that the Tennessee figure is 671,901 acres, so there would be even more acreage than I at first stated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be about 10,000 acres more than the amount necessary to meet the formula?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the pending bill was reported, I introduced a bill, S. 2615, which I had intended offering as an amendment, had not the bill contained provisions, which set up 65 percent of the average acreage, and also provide a minimum of 45 percent, which, I believe, was contained in the law of 1950. Is it the understanding of the Senator from New Mexico that whether it is 45 percent or 50 percent, the State of Tennessee would not be materially affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill would not materially affect the State of Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many Tennessee farmers, as apparently is true of farmers in Arkansas and other States, have expressed a great deal of concern about the increased allocation to California and Arizona, not only with reference to this year, but also with reference to what might happen in the future. Is there any assurance, or can the Senator from New Mexico express any opinion, as to whether these increased allocations, under the present formula, will be carried out in the years to come, or whether there will be new requests for additional allotments to those States?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, as I tried to say earlier, that by 1955, if quotas are

provided for 1955, the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico will gain nothing by a 66-percent gadget. Because of their large plantings in previous years, no device of this special nature will be needed for either California or Arizona.

The cotton-producing history of California and Arizona for 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, which will be the 5 years under consideration, will be sufficiently high so that those States will need no special 34-percent gadget to take care of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and the opinion of other members of the committee, that in the event there is to be a cotton quota in years to come, there will be necessity for some special gadget or quota for California, Arizona, and New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am quite sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that in the years to come Congress will apply the principle to all the States, including the Southern States and Western States alike?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not want to try to commit Congress, but I think that is probably what the facts will reveal at that time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the Senator's own opinion, and we consider him to be a great authority on the problem of agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his explanation of the bill. In the first part of his statement, I noticed he made a point that the bill is merely temporary legislation on the subject of cotton-acreage allocation. However, the Senator from New Mexico recognizes that there are certain parts of the old law with respect to administration that need some continuing legislation for 1954. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is not saying to the Senate, is he, that the bill covers all the problems, or even goes into all the problems, that need attention?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi that the bill does not touch many agricultural problems. The one he has mentioned ought to be acted upon only after notice has been given and open hearings have been held. That is why it is not touched in the proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the present position of the Senator from New Mexico is that that is an important matter, and perhaps he would have liked to go into it, but because of the time emergency with reference to planting he

did not go into it and make a recommendation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Another point involved is the broader use of power by State and county committees in using the reserves available to them. Is not that another matter which needs some continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a matter which I do not feel may need legislation, but it needs consideration by the committee, and probably the committee will recommend legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate having the opinion of the Senator on these matters, because they are urgent and important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator from New Mexico leaves that question, and on the same point, does he mean that he does not believe the Senate should consider what might be termed permanent provisions in connection with the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion. I do not think they should be considered now, because if we go into matters of that kind, we might find that we shall be here for many months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think such provisions are included in the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion, and I tried to give it to him. I am not trying to speak for the committee.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture has advised me that it will be between 2 and 3 weeks after the bill becomes law, if it becomes law, before the Department can really give final allocations for 1954. As I understand, in some areas cotton planting will be started in about 2 weeks from now. That is the reason why we did not take up some of the other matters we realized ought to be considered. I can assure the Senator from Arkansas that there will be an opportunity to take up matters which pertain to permanent law. It was after the Department told us they would require 2 or 3 weeks following the signing of the bill to place the law into operation that the committee decided to handle the matter on an emergency basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the matters not covered in the bill, for example, the question of the Secretary of Agriculture being permitted to take into consideration the normal rate of abandonment and also underplanting, does not the Senator believe that they are matters which need the consideration of Congress, in connection with continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am fairly

well satisfied with the pending bill, but I recognize that there are many persons who are not. I should be very happy to have the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry take up the other matters, but they could not possibly be handled in the pending bill.

Within 2 or 3 weeks farmers will begin planting cotton in Texas and Florida, and they are entitled to know as soon as possible what the allotments will be. It will take 2 or 3 weeks after the bill becomes law before the Secretary of Agriculture can advise the various States. So we thought it best to act promptly on this bill. As a matter of fact, not many persons thought we could get a bill to the Senate floor as quickly as this bill got here, and I commend the leadership for getting it here so quickly.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to make it clear that even though we pass over these matters, it is recognized that they should be considered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have not heard all the debate on the bill. Some of the things in which I am very much interested have been covered in the Senator's remarks and in his reply to the questions asked by other Senators. However, I was very much interested in the questions of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in the replies to those questions, and also with respect to the questions of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], with respect to the contention that the bill is intended to be strictly a stopgap measure for 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct with reference to cotton.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am speaking with reference to cotton.

I understood further that the passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form would not preclude the conferees from considering some of the permanent provisions which are in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe I said that, but I agree that that is true. The passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form, if we strike out everything after the enacting clause in the bill as passed by the House, would not preclude the conferees from considering the House bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to differentiate between the bill we are considering now and the bill the Senate may pass, for example, as a substitute for the House bill.

The bill does not take into account, is not intended to, and does not undertake to enact, permanent legislation or to incorporate provisions which would extend beyond 1954. The bill as it passed the House does incorporate some such provisions. There will be the opportunity in conference to consider provisions which some of us would like to have considered in conference and possibly have incorporated in the bill in its final form. That opportunity is present, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Or that opportunity will be present if the pending bill

is passed as a substitute for the House measure?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that there has been a discussion of permanent changes. The bill provides only for temporary legislation.

It was also pointed out that if we did what it is proposed to do; namely, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the Senate bill as a substitute, these matters could be considered. Many Members of the Senate, including members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would like to consider these matters. The conferees have the right to look these provisions over.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill provides that the county committee shall have three different methods of allocating to individual farmers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a very important provision of the bill. The provision permitting the county committee to use three different methods of allocating to the individual farmers in the county is not in the bill as it passed the House, but is strictly a Senate provision. It is intended as a stopgap measure only for this year.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember whether that provision was in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to make certain that the county committees had such authority, and that that was the intent of the provision. The county committee, in its discretion, can use the historic factor with regard to each farm for making the county quota allocation to that farm.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not quite understand what the Senator said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the provision, after the allocation of the increased acreage is made to the State, this bill increases the national acreage allotment from 17,910,448 acres to 21 million acres, and for individual allotments provides a formula of percentages of 65, 40, and 50. After these allotments have been taken care of, if there is acreage left over in a county for further allocation to individual farmers, then the county committee may, in its discretion, make allocations to individual farmers, based on previous farm history.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The county committee has the discretion to make the allocations in any of those ways.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the county committee can make further distribution or allocation upon the basis of farm history, if it deems it wise to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from Arkansas asked me the question, he did not speak of the percentages of 65, 40, and 50.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not.

Mr. ANDERSON. I fully agree with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Louisiana. The way the Senator from Arkansas has stated it is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision in the bill is limited to 1954.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there are to be any permanent features incorporated in the legislation at this session, assuming that no amendments are offered to correct some of the deficiencies we find in the measure, they will have to be taken from the bill as it passed the House or the conferees will have to work out in conference those provisions and the final language of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has already developed, more ably than I could have done, the points I had in mind. I should like to point out further that I believe it is fair to say that there is much sentiment among Senators for some of the permanent features which are contained in the bill as it passed the House. Those provisions will all be a proper subject for consideration by the conference committee, and it is the hope of the junior Senator from Tennessee that the committee will give consideration to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Tennessee that they will be fairly considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield, or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the presentation he has made on the floor of the Senate of the pending bill. It was because of the emergency aspects of the measure, which the Senator has pointed out, that a general agreement was arrived at at the several meetings to which the Senator referred, and because of the position taken by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that a bill should be reported that could be handled in an emergency sort of way in order to meet the dates which will soon face us, that the majority leader, at the request of a number of Members of the Senate, especially members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, agreed to schedule this bill ahead of several highly controversial measures which will be facing decision by the Senate in the immediate future. Otherwise, had it not been given the right of way, it might have gotten behind several weeks of debate on other measures, which would have adversely affected the objective the committee was trying to accomplish.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the majority leader that those interested in the bill appreciate very much the scheduling of the bill at this time, because if it had gotten behind several weeks of debate, no good whatever would have been done by the bill, because then action upon it would have been too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 17, after the word "section" and the period, it is proposed to insert:

Before apportioning such unallocated acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallocated acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator from Mississippi rise to explain the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; or if the Senate is ready to vote, that is all right, and I shall not explain the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have a little explanation of the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this amendment means that after acreage is allocated from the State's increased allotment under the 65-40-50 provision, then the State committee is authorized to allocate acreage to the 5-acre man or to the man who grows less than 5 acres and who is exempt from acreage reduction, in order to bring up his allotment to his exemption, which the law requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, let me say that I do not quite understand this amendment. I thought the 5-acre man was already taken care of.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are a great many counties in the country where the county allotment was not sufficient to give the 5-acre man the 5 acres to which he was entitled.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This amendment is intended to insure, then, that each man has at least 5 acres; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; if the farmer has grown 3 acres, he will get 3 acres. If he has grown 4 acres, he will get 4 acres. If he has grown 5 acres, he will get 5 acres. That is the maximum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, the purpose of the amendment is to insure that if in the past the farmer has grown 5 acres, that much acreage will be assured to him as the minimum. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The amendment provides that minimum in the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the State or in the county?

Mr. EASTLAND. In the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, this has to be done at the State level. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, because under the provisions of this bill many counties would not get sufficient acreage to be able to build up the 5-acre farmers to that amount.

This amendment was presented to the committee by my colleague the junior

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the first place, this amendment would not change the allocation of acreage in the bill, as between the States, would it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir.

Mr. KERR. In the second place, as I understand the amendment, it does not apply to a State with reference to which the allocation in the bill is inadequate to give the 65 percent of the 3-year average to all the farmers in the State. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

This amendment does not add an acre to this bill. The amendment purely has to do with the distribution of each State's quota, after each State secures its quota.

Mr. KERR. The amendment has to do with distribution within a State if there is any surplus acreage left after every farmer has received 65 percent of the 3-year average. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. This amendment means that in most of the States the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. As a practical proposition, yes; the amendment will mean that, except as to Florida and Texas, which require approximately 80,000 acres.

Mr. HILL. But in all the other States, as a practical operation this amendment means that the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres this year, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. It means that the farmer in practically every State will get the exemption to which the law says he is entitled.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in practically every State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think this bill is a distinct improvement over the orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and the allotment of 17,900,000 acres to all the cotton-producing States of the Nation. However, it appears to me that the bill contains features which are discriminatory and unjustified.

I believe the provision which provides for 315,000 additional acres, and then gives half of that acreage to 3 States arbitrarily, and not on the basis of permanent legislation which has been in effect for years, is unjustified and constitutes special privilege by legislation, in favor of the beneficiary States, and against the great majority of the cotton-producing States.

I have been greatly impressed by what has been said here about the emergency

features of the bill. I have been somewhat intimidated by the chairman of the committee; who has dared Senators to move to recommit the bill if it does not suit them—in effect saying to them that they will either take this bill or the Benson order of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. President, I respect the committee—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I did not quite understand the Senator from Oklahoma when he referred to "the Benson order." He means, does he not, that the public law requires the cotton acreage to be that much, unless Congress enacts the measure now before the Senate?

Mr. KERR. I understood there was a man by the name of Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, and that he had issued an order about the cotton acreage allotments for 1954.

Mr. THYE. In order that we may be certain we are not accusing one man, let me say there is a public law which this Congress or a previous Congress enacted, and the Secretary of Agriculture must follow that provision of law. Therefore, in the event this Congress does nothing about the pending measure, the Secretary of Agriculture must revert to that public law; and therefore there would be only 17,900,000-plus acres of cotton to allocate to the States in accordance with the historic base that each State and each county had.

As a member of the subcommittee, I, along with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], studied the question covered by the pending legislative proposal. We studied it as carefully as any three men could. We were serving as a subcommittee of the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This measure was the very best we could possibly recommend to the full committee and to the Senate.

The only reason why special acreage allotments were provided for or taken into consideration for Arizona and California was simply that there is a growing population in the Nation. No one can deny that. California and Arizona had some land come into production, through irrigation; and some came into production because of a military request or a national-defense measure.

When the drastic cut-back occurred because of a previous public law, the subcommittee, acting for the full Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, arrived at the only possible sound recommendation, as embodied in the provision for Arizona and California. So that the subcommittee would be correct in its consideration, the question was submitted to a farm organization representing the cotton-producing States of the South, in order that they might assist in advising us. This particular farm group gave consideration and, according to their best judgment, made to us a recommendation which we embodied along with the best judgment that those of us serving on the subcommittee had; and we submitted it to the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the

full committee finally acted. That is the question before us.

With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, I ask him not to refer to the law as one individual's law, because the National Legislature enacted the law to provide 17,900,000 plus acres as a cotton base. That is what we shall have if we do not pass some other measure.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator name the particular farm organization which made the recommendation? If he did, I did not understand it.

Mr. THYE. I shall be very happy to name it. It was the National Farm Bureau Federation, which happened to consider the subject at one of its national conferences. I had met those gentlemen before, not only in connection with discussions of the cotton question, but in the discussion of other agricultural questions. I have found them to be a pretty reliable body on which to lean.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his confessions and observations. But, Mr. President, I do not recognize the Farm Bureau Federation as the agricultural authority for prescribing farm programs for the State of Oklahoma. I recognize them as a great organization. Their president probably is the most powerful contribution that the Republican Party has made to this administration. However, I do not happen to agree with him on many vital issues affecting the people of Oklahoma. Nor do I permit him to speak for me on this floor. Nor am I bound by what he says when he speaks. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to be so bound, that is his privilege; but I disown it either as a privilege or obligation of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Was not the Senator mistaken when he referred to a cotton-acreage allotment as one individual's proposal? Was he not mistaken when he referred to it as an order of Mr. Benson rather than as a public law on the statute books?

Mr. KERR. In that regard I will say that I do not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture in the interpretation which he accepted, either from the Farm Bureau Federation or from his Solicitor, as to the amount of acreage that should be allotted for the year 1954, under the law then in effect. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to accept without question the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the meaning of law, that is his privilege; but it is neither my prerogative nor my duty. I disown it and disclaim it and refuse to be bound by it. I say that it was a Benson order. I say that there are serious differences of opinion as to whether or not the allotment could have been anything else. I, for one, am of the belief that it did not have to be that figure. Its issuance by Benson makes it neither legal, sacred, nor above criticism or dispute, so far as I am concerned. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma will still have to admit that it is a public law.

Mr. KERR. No. The Senator from Oklahoma proclaims that it was an order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Under a public law.

Mr. KERR. Based upon what he said his concept of a public law was, yes; with which concept I do not agree.

I do not acknowledge that the Secretary of Agriculture can speak for the Senator from Oklahoma; and I wish to say to my good friend from Minnesota that he is free from any such bonds or shackles, except as he chooses to accept them.

I repeat that I prefer the provisions of this bill, as reported by the committee, to the Benson order. But I still agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the bill contains provisions which constitute legislative special privileges for certain States and certain industries.

The provision with reference to authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to spend \$100 million to support the price of Irish potatoes is no part of the emergency cotton acreage situation which confronts the Congress. I wish to say to my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for whom I have as much respect and affection as for any other Member of the Senate, that I could not be in more complete disagreement with any man than I am with him when he says that the Secretary of Agriculture has spent money for the benefit of the meat producers, in spending \$100 million to buy canned meat, hamburger, and canned gravy from the packers. That operation has left the producers where it found them—broke—and it has resulted, in 1953, in the packers having an increase of 50 percent in their net profits over the preceding year. It was an act by the Secretary of Agriculture which penalized the consumers. It raised the price of processed meat on every meat counter in America. He did not compete with the packer for the live animal, for the benefit of the producer. He competed with the millions of consumers of the country for the product, to the benefit of the packers. Their financial reports for last year reflect greatly increased profits, brought about directly by reason of the bonus with which the Secretary of Agriculture provided them, under the guise of an act on his part for the benefit of the meat producers.

Let me say to the sponsors of the potato amendment that if the Secretary of Agriculture uses section 32 money for the benefit of potato producers on the same basis that it is claimed he used it for the benefit of cattle producers, he will spend the money buying potato chips, French-fried potatoes, industrial alcohol, and vodka, which are the products of the processors of Irish potatoes, and which, I assure Senators, will lend small comfort to the producers of the potatoes.

Mr. President, this is an emergency measure. I resent the fact that the chairman of the committee has said to the Senate, "Take it or recommit it." That is intimidation and coercion which is unjustified and unwarranted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator permit the Senator from Vermont to accept the compliment just paid him by the Senator from Oklahoma? The Senator from Vermont is very happy to learn that he can intimidate the Senator from Oklahoma, but he is sure that he has not rendered the Senator from Oklahoma speechless.

Mr. KERR. I will say that if the Senator from Vermont is ever rendered speechless, it will be a phenomenon which I have never contemplated, and the evidences of which I have yet to see. I compliment his power, yes; but neither his using it nor his parading it. Perhaps the emergency is sufficient to justify bowing to coercion and intimidation, but I hope the day will never come when those who represent the rank and file of the cotton producers will be in the position of intimidating or coercing anyone in order to obtain simple justice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I call up an amendment, on page 2, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one-fourth."

On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three-fourths."

Mr. KERR. The effect of the amendment would be to reallocate the 315,000 bonus acreage which is provided for in the bill, and would distribute it one-fourth to the 3 Western States and three-fourths to the historic cotton-producing States. I believe, in the interest of equity and justice, and in order to eliminate to some extent the discriminatory features of the language of the bill as written, the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment would be to take away from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California an allotment of cotton acreage which is absolutely essential if distress among numerous cotton growers in those States is to be avoided.

So far as the large cotton operators in my State are concerned—and I believe the statement applies to California—namely, those who are able to stand a reduction, it would be much better for them in the long run to allow nature to take its course, so to speak; that is, to allow the cotton to be produced in those areas of the United States where a pound of it can be produced at less cost than elsewhere. That is the reason why there has been an increase in the cotton acreage in New Mexico, Arizona, and California. In those States cotton can be produced at less cost—in fact, at about half the cost—because they can produce more pounds per acre.

If there were no action taken at all, and the allotment remained at 17,900,000 acres, we would have to endure it only for 1 year, certainly for not more than 2 years, and even in the second year we

would get credit for the acreage history which we would have made in 1953, and that history would help us along.

There are those in the Western areas—and I am speaking now about the large growers—who, because of their financial ability, would be pleased to see the allotment remain as it is. But that would be exceedingly hard on a large number of people who have grown cotton only for a short time, for they would be reduced to practically no acreage at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arizona understand that the acreage referred to is hardship acreage?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Where is the hardship?

Mr. HAYDEN. The hardship is in the States to which the additional acreage has been assigned by the committee bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. Hardship is the sole reason for the assignment of the acreage. The impression seems to have spread that some very wealthy cotton producers have gone into the cotton-growing business in Arizona and California and that they are the ones who would be benefited by the provision referred to and which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to strike out. The provision was not put into the bill for that purpose at all. It was for the purpose of assisting the smaller growers, namely, those who have been planting cotton for only a year or two. In two counties in Arizona, Yuma, and Cochise County, cotton has been planted only recently to any great extent. They would have practically no opportunity to plant anything at all. They would have to go out of the business.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that because they have been planting cotton for only the past 3 years or so?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And because each year they have doubled or tripled the planting of the year before?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have planted more acres to cotton. The result is that they are building up a cotton history, which they do not have now.

Such a history would be immensely valuable to them. If we did nothing but stand by what the Secretary of Agriculture has done, those who could afford it would be better off, because they would have the benefit of the history which has been built up in the past 2 or 3 years, but which does not do them any good now.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the face of it, it looks like discrimination to place a special provision in the bill to take care of growers who just recently started to plant and grow cotton, whereas the historic cotton-producing States, which have grown cotton all the time, must make a concession in order to aid those States which just recently entered the production of cotton. On the face of it,

it appears to be unfair to ask the older States to make these tremendous sacrifices. I do not charge that to be a fact, but I say, on the face of it, it looks as though we are giving some special consideration to States which have just started the growing of cotton.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out, first, that the total increase in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States, and that it is a provision by which distress may be relieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to make two points: First, with respect to the new cotton growers, the history is based upon a 5-year period. The law refers to the 5 years preceding the year in which the proclamation of quotas is made. That means that on 1954 quotas, announced in 1953, the years 1952, 1951, 1950, 1949, and 1948. The Secretary of Agriculture has ruled that since 1949 cannot be counted, the year 1947 is to be used instead. The cotton growers in California wanted to take the Secretary into court. I believe they could take him into court successfully, because the law calls for the last 5 years. However, a 6-year period is taken, with the year 1949 being dropped out because it was not to be counted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is being done without any authority of law. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Secretary has made a very careful study of it, but I know what we intended to do, because I wrote that part of the bill.

The second point I wish to make is that cotton-producing States get credit for other crops planted. In many States during the war the farmers would stop growing cotton for a few years and get credit for the production of other crops. We always carried the credits ahead, and some States received dual credit, one credit for wheat, for example, and another for cotton, grown on the same land, or they would get credit for cotton and proceed to plant soybeans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the Senator meant that it was done in my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure it was not done in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator from New Mexico confirm what I say, namely, that if it comes to choosing between the provisions of the bill and standing on the law as it reads today we in New Mexico, Arizona, and California would be in a far better position eventually if we abided by the present law.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about it in my mind.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we would gain immediately under the historic basis, inasmuch as if we stopped production for 1 year we would get credit for the acreage. In other words, it is inevitable that the growing of cotton will move west where it can be grown at less cost a pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I have been in a cotton meeting in his State and sat right

beside him while the cotton farmers were saying they would prefer to have the 17-million-acre allotment stand for the next year, but I think that would work great hardship across the country, and it would work great hardship in the Senator's State. There were persons in the meeting who could stand it, but the small cotton farmer of Arizona could not stand it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was about to ask the Senator whether he considered the provision to give half of the approximately 300,000 acres special increase provided in the bill to the three States mentioned would be an advantage to those States over the original allotment of 17,900,000 acres?

Mr. HAYDEN. They would have to be balanced in order really to determine what would be best.

What I was trying to say was that in Arizona, California, and New Mexico we can grow cotton at less cost than elsewhere in the United States. We can produce more pounds per acre at less cost per pound. The grade of cotton we grow by careful selection of seed is the kind of cotton the manufacturer desires to buy. Proportionately, in that there are not so many pounds going into the loan as in the South.

Those are facts which cannot be overlooked. It is clearly indicated that the movement is to the West. While it may be a disadvantage to the South this year and next year, if the law operates as it must, and we go along in the regular way, we will continue to grow more cotton in the western area, and as we build up our acreage—

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means, does he not, that if there were no controls the farmers would continue to build up a cotton-producing history.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Or, if we had controls, we would still gain the advantage of additional history made prior to the controls. We have devoted much of the land to cotton in the past 2 or 3 years, and do not have a 5-year history.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I understood the Senator to say that without this special increase and special allocation assigned to the 3 States mentioned, his State would really be better off with an allocation of 17,900,000 acres instead of one of 21,000,000 acres.

Mr. HAYDEN. The increased amount provided for in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States. The old cotton-growing States get as many additional acres as do the new ones. We need to take care of the small grower, not the large producer who could worry along very well on the basis of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I do not understand is why the 3 States need to take care of the small growers when an overall increase of 3,000,000 acres is provided above the 17,900,000 acres under existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we do not have the background of a cotton-growing history. We would not have more than 10 or 15 percent of the acreage, because cotton planting in the western area is so recent. The provision is designed to meet hardship cases.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood from the junior Senator from New Mexico awhile ago, in discussing the provisions of the bill, that this is a stop-gap bill, a measure to meet the emergency situation of this year, because of the planting season being right at hand, so that if any legislation is to be enacted it must be enacted quickly in order to make it effective for this year; but after this year, in the general legislation which is to follow, the overall farm program legislation, such special features, such as this provision in the bill, will not be required.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because, in the meantime, we shall have built up our history of cotton growing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is to enable the farmers this year to build up their history so that next year in permanent legislation they can be on an even basis with the traditional cotton-growing States without asking any special provision for increased acreage.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator has stated it well.

There is one other matter I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, with reference to Anderson, Clayton & Co. They are represented in Arizona by a subsidiary which buys and gins cotton. The only amortization I know of was in connection with a company called the Federal Warehouse & Compress Co., whose headquarters I think, are in Memphis. It is made up of people from Arkansas and Tennessee who moved to Arizona and erected some oil mills. My recollection is they received tax amortization on three of those mills. But that does not apply to Anderson, Clayton & Co. The mills were badly needed in order to take care of the situation.

The same thing is true of compresses. We needed them very badly. The normal market for the cotton produced in that area before the war was Japan. We hope that in due time the bales can be compressed for shipment overseas.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had charge of the bill, has stated that the necessity for the expeditious enactment of the bill as proposed prevented the consideration of some provisions which certainly some farmers and those who represent some of the farmers feel should be in independent legislation.

I think we all realize the necessity for expeditious action on this bill. Some provisions which we may call long-term provisions have already been adverted to, but I desire to emphasize what I feel to be the need for those provisions in independent legislation by referring to 2 or 3 of them.

Specifically, I should like to call attention to the fact that the authority for the use of reserve acreage, both at the county and State levels, should be broadened. This would provide State and county committees with the machinery to meet more adequately problems commonly referred to as "hardship cases." Local farmer-elected committeemen are more nearly in a position to

judge the extent of hardships and should have the latitude to meet local conditions at the local level.

Secondly, while the percentage of cropland factor method of distributing acreage by the county to the farm, as is now provided in the law, fits some parts of the Cotton Belt, a farm history method of distribution would more nearly fill the requirements of other sections.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I was particularly interested in. So, I inquired of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] regarding the provisions of the bill on page 3, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, which were amended a while ago by the committee amendment offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] which does give the county committee discretion to use 1 of 3 methods.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I was going to invite attention to that fact. The bill does give the county committees a discretionary power to make the selection.

As I understand, this provision, which is considered highly desirable, applies only to 1954. As I said in the first instance, I wish to call attention to what I would call long-term provisions, which I think ought to be included in any cotton legislation, not merely for 1954, but also for succeeding years. That is what I am calling attention to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was particularly interested in having the emergency legislation give such authority and discretion to the county committees, because I feel that they know best what will fit the local situations, and can more equitably provide for the extra allotment or distribution. In my opinion, although there may be some exceptions, generally the historical basis is the better way to handle the matter.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. The Senator from Arkansas and I find ourselves in full accord. What I was seeking to do was to emphasize that this provision ought to be carried not only for 1954, but should be written into the law for succeeding years.

Thirdly, the Secretary of Agriculture should have the authority to take into consideration normal underplantings and abandoned acres in setting the level of allotment for any particular year.

The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent of the total acreage planted to cotton. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was estimated by the USDA at 3.7 percent.

In 1950, the last year of acreage controls, underplantings amounted to more than 10 percent of the total allotment. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has ruled that the Secretary does not have the authority to take these important facts into consideration in making his calculations.

The Secretary should be permitted to use all of the information available to him in arriving at an allotment figure.

Finally, S. 2643 provides that the additional acreage allotted to States will first be used by State committees to provide that all farms will receive an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted on the farm in any one of these 3 years, provided that this acreage does not exceed 50 percent of the tilled land on the farm. This 50 percent cropland limitation more nearly fits the farming system in irrigated areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that the committee of conference might properly consider these suggestions?

Mr. HILL. The only reason I am now addressing the Senate is that I very much hope the committee of conference will give these matters their earnest consideration, and do some of the very things I am certain the Senator from Arkansas and I very much wish to see done. I agree with the position of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that when the bill goes to conference, the conferees will go thoroughly into the matters and consider them carefully. I hope that as many of these provisions as possible will be written into the bill by the committee of conference.

Incidentally, the conference committee will have very wide latitude because, as the Senator knows, there are 2 different bills, 1 passed by the House, and the bill now before the Senate. So, under the rules, the conference will have very wide latitude.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, this feature would benefit most the farmers who have helped to build the surplus by failure to practice diversification and continuing to plant a high percentage of their cropland in cotton. This extra benefit to the high-planting farm would be at the expense of the family farmer, who has sought diligently to diversify his farming. A 40-percent cropland limitation on hardship cotton acres would prevent inequities on farms that have continued high cotton plantings and, at the same time, would assure a wider and fairer distribution of the State's additional cotton allotment, thereby benefiting a greater number of farms. This is the same cropland limitation that was in effect in 1950, and I can see no reason why it would not work equally as well in 1954.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture spent many days, during the summer of 1953, in hearing and considering the problems of cotton acreage and apportionment. If we fail to act now upon these questions of technical administration, we are merely postponing, for a few weeks or months, problems that will again have to be considered at a time when the Members of Congress will be much more deeply involved in other pressing legislation.

The farmer's welfare and the welfare of the whole Nation, so dependent upon the economic well-being of the farmer, demands that we act now.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I heartily favor the 40-percent limitation. I hope something along that line can be worked out in conference. The committee agreed to it, but the solicitor for the Department of Agriculture could not devise a gadget that would work. He is now working on one. If he can develop it, I think it will be adopted.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am very much gratified to know that he feels as I do about this provision. I may say that I am also very much gratified to know that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will be on the committee of conference. I know that the Senate can repose great faith in him as a member of the conference, feeling as he does with particular reference to this provision. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas suggests very frankly and very forthrightly, we are relying on the Senator from Mississippi.

I strongly feel that the provision to which I have adverted should be included in cotton legislation, not simply for this year, but also for succeeding years. I hope the committee of conference, representing the Senate and the House, will have the same desire to see this provision included in the bill and will report to Congress proposed legislation containing such a provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I was about to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that the proposed legislation which has been presented to the Senate as meeting an emergency situation, which I believe was generally recognized as an emergency, will not be so altered by the conference committee as to change the equity of the bill or the spirit in which it has been presented to the Senate. It is expected that permanent legislation will be reported later, but I should not want the statement to stand in the RECORD that there was a general invitation so to change the bill that it would come back to the Senate not looking like the type of equitable legislation pending before the Senate today.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I think this provision would not change the equity, the justice, or, I may even say, in many ways the emergency nature of the bill. I think these provisions would greatly enhance and confirm the equity and justice of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand the Senator from Alabama, he desires to have in the bill a workable, legal provision to the effect that if the West wants 50 percent, it can have it; and if the

South wants 50 percent, it can have it.

Mr. HILL. If the South wants 40 percent, it can have it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; the South may have it. It must be worked out in a legal manner.

Mr. HILL. I think that it can be worked out in such a manner that it will in no way change the fundamental character of what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has referred to as the equity or justice of the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would seem to me that if we could divide the 315,000 acres in such a way that it meant about 13 and a fraction percent to the 3 Western States and about 1 percent to the other States, it ought to be possible to split the cropland allotment in some way that would do justice to the southeastern historic cotton-growing area, at least.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Georgia has so well suggested, I think there is no danger of injustice in the proposal. On the other hand, I think the proposal is shot through with justice.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama gave me the privilege of reading portions of his statement before he delivered it in the Senate, so I am familiar with it, although I was not in the Chamber at the time he delivered it. The Senator from Alabama was referring to matters of administration and changes that are needed in the law regardless of what the acreage allotments may be. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is pleading for permanent, continuing legislation in connection with the administration of the law. It will be needed as much in future years as it is for the year 1954.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly correct. One of the provisions is that the election shall be left with the county committee as to which method shall be used. That is written into the 1954 allotment. I say that is good. We ought to have it for 1954, and we ought to have it for succeeding years.

Mr. STENNIS. On that point, no one needs to be disturbed about the equity of the proposal.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator would enlighten me a little about the question of the difficulty of adjustment with the Western States. On page 174 of the hearings before the Senate committee I find that in Alabama there will be about 6½ acres per voter, and in California 35.1 acres. Why is it so much more difficult for a man who has a large farm to take a cut than it is for the man with a small farm, and why is that an argument for the added allocation to California?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the one hand, I do not believe such an argument is a good one, and on the other hand, I think what we ought to do is to encourage, as much as possible, what we call the family farm, a farm on which a man and his family live. He and his family not only vote there, but they run and operate the farm. That is the type of farm of which there are so many in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill with a great deal of reluctance.

It is a measure which will create some injustices. It will not, in every instance, distribute the cotton acreage according to strict standards of fairness.

Were there time, I would offer some amendments. They would seek to meet the peculiar conditions under which cotton is planted in Texas—conditions which are not duplicated on the same scale in any other State.

Unfortunately, there is not time. Amendments at this point would involve time-consuming debate and study. They would result in delay, and our cotton farmers, particularly the cotton farmers of Texas, cannot afford delay.

Texas every year plants the first and almost if not the last acre of cotton planted in the United States. The planting starts in south Texas and moves gradually north.

A few of our farmers in South Texas and the lower Rio Grande Valley will start planting before the end of the month. Large-scale planting will start early in February.

Our south Texas farmers cannot plan their operations with any confidence in the future unless Congress acts speedily. Without a law, they will not know how much to plant.

I do not feel that their future should be jeopardized by a prolonged debate over a highly complicated issue. There are more than 3,400,000 acres of cotton land involved in this bill—some 1,300,000 additional acres for Texas. The farmers of America are entitled to know as soon as possible what they can count upon as their share.

There is one other point I should like to make. Between the Senate and the House bills, there is sufficient leeway to permit an adjustment that will go for toward solving the situation. This adjustment can be reached in the conference committee, and I am assured by some of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who will be on the conference that remedial language will be carefully considered when the conferees discuss both the House and Senate bills.

I am foregoing lengthy discussion now on the unusual problems of Texas—problems complicated by geographical distribution and different types of farming.

I shall be ready to assist the conferees in any possible manner. It is a difficult and complex issue and I hope it can be solved in a spirit of reason. I also hope there will come back to the Senate in a conference report a bill which will assist us in our State to make allotments directly to the counties on the same basis on which the national allotments are made to the State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been stressed here again and again that the pending measure is emergency legislation, and is applicable only in the year 1954, and on that basis, and on that basis alone, I have been able to bring myself to support the bill.

I can see no justification for the great increases that have been given to the irrigated areas. In the division of the extra 315,000 acres we find that 157,000 acres is given to 3 States which are comparative newcomers in cotton production, compared with the 157,000 which is allocated to the 11 or 12 other States which have been engaged in the production of cotton for many decades. More than that, another gadget has been inserted in the bill which has the effect of giving 59,000 acres to the States of Arizona and California.

It may well be that in the economic shifts which have occurred in the life of this land there has been a shift in the production of cotton from the historic areas where it was produced for so long, areas which produced cotton and exported it to the markets of the world in sufficient quantity to maintain a favorable balance of trade for our country for more than 80 years by the sale of that commodity alone. It may be that cotton can be produced in the irrigated States of the West cheaper than in the South, and that the old cotton States will be forced out of the cotton business. If that is to happen by economic forces, there is nothing that can stop it. But, I certainly do regret that it is found necessary to accelerate that program on the basis of gifts such as will be awarded under the proposed law.

My support of the pending bill on the 1-year basis certainly cannot be taken as a precedent for the future when cotton legislation is before this body for consideration.

There are some provisions in the bill that will prevent a great many hardships. The additional acreage involved is necessary because of a very patent failure in the basic law which provides for the distribution of cotton on the basis of historical production as between the States, which instructs the States to allocate it as between the counties in the States on the basis of historical production, and then in the counties themselves, where the base has been established it is distributed on the basis of cropland.

That has brought about a great dislocation on many farms. They were prepared to produce cotton. They had the labor available. Anyone who is familiar with agricultural life in America knows that it takes more downright back-breaking hand labor to produce cotton than it does to produce any other commodity with the possible exception of tobacco.

The bill does eliminate that inequity by giving the increased acreage on the 65, 40, and 50 percent basis.

In passing I wish to say to the Senators who have spent so much time on the bill and who will serve as conferees that I hope that some arrangement can be worked out that will retain the 40 percent basis, at least for the Southeastern States.

Another great advantage of the bill is that it helps to cure the basic weakness in the original law, which distributes the cotton acreage on the basis of cropland rather than on the historic basis. It is very helpful to have in the proposed bill a provision which permits any farmer to turn in to the county committee for redistribution any acreage allotment which he will not use. That will go a long way in remedying some of the more acute conditions and preventing a dislocation of many farmers.

If some relief is not afforded such as is provided in this bill, hundreds of the poorest people in this land, those who have the lowest income in the Nation, tenant farmers and sharecroppers, will practically be put "in the road," because there will be no work for them on many farms where the original allotments are so small.

I share the hope that the conferees will devise ways and means of providing permanent legislation that will establish a fairer and more equitable basis for the distribution of our basic national allotments when it comes to the distribution within the county to the individual farms. It should be done on a historic cotton-acreage basis rather than on cropland.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will eliminate the many very great hardships that would have been prevalent under the failures and weaknesses of the basic law. It is a 1-year bill. I hope that the conference committee will devise a fairer measure than either the House or Senate bill. If one is proposed which is a fairer one than either the temporary legislation or the permanent legislation proposed in the House bill, I shall give it my support.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator recognizes the fact that we are confronted with an emergency situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, if time were not of the very essence, the measure undoubtedly would be on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 weeks, during which time we would thresh out once and for all some of these very important questions regarding the allotment of cotton acreage. I regret that time does not permit the writing of a more equitable bill. However, we know that a delay in the Senate means no law at all can be enacted.

I desire to congratulate my friends from the wheat-producing areas for having been able, last year, to get through legislation relating to wheat allotments, and not be confronted with the condition in which those of us who came from areas that are primarily devoted to the production of cotton find ourselves today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say that the Senator from Georgia has very ably expressed my sentiments regarding this bill. We are here confronted with such a situation that obviously we cannot take time to try to solve these problems and at the same time meet the urgency that is upon us.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are confronted with a very grave condition, and we are operating with a very tight time limitation. For that reason alone I can justify my support of the pending bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished and able junior Senator from Georgia has voiced the thought in my mind more ably than I could have done, with respect to the shift, by means of legislation, in the production of a basic commodity from a historic area of production to a new area of production.

Will not the Senator from Georgia, with his great ability, also indicate to the Senate his agreement with me, if he entertains it, that in an area where the production is the product of many hands, many small homesteads, such a shift of production will occasion far greater human hardship than will be relieved by granting additional acreage to certain production areas where the land is owned in large tracts and is irrigated, thereby bringing in great production?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Tennessee well knows that particularly in the hill areas of his State and my State and all the other historic cotton-producing States, the average cotton farm is very small, sometimes having only 3, 4, or 5 acres. Cotton produced there is tediously dug out of the ground—and the hill country is more often than not rocky ground—with hoes and pony plows. This cotton is picked by the fingers of women and children and placed into bags swung from their shoulders. It is carried long distances on weary backs before the cotton is weighted and sent to the gin.

This tremendous shift in cotton to the high producing irrigated areas is a great blow to thousands of small family-sized farms. The large number of cotton farms in any one of the historic cotton producing States as compared with the small number of cotton farms in the States that have only lately come into the field of cotton production with irrigated lands will demonstrate that when we speak in terms of human beings, human welfare, and human values, we are adversely affecting the lives of thousands of poor people by reducing the only cash income they have when we take cotton away from the historic cotton producing States. In the new irrigated areas farming is mechanized, and in most instances these large farms are owned and operated by corporations.

These shifts in production depress the already low standards of living of the very poorest people of the Nation. Any table of statistics relating to national income which can possibly be produced will show that the lowest annual income goes to the small cotton farmers of the historic Cotton Belt.

These people who are already our poorest will be further disadvantaged by shifts in production to the corporate farms in irrigated areas. To deny them the opportunity to produce a few pounds of cotton, which is their only source of cash income, is a serious matter. They are so poor it gets down to a question of being able to provide shoes for their

children. Reductions in their income involves real hardship and privation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on amendment B, I hope the Members of the Senate will realize that the amendment only reduces the acreage for the State of New Mexico. The amendment is supposed to reduce by one-half the hardship acreage for the States of Arizona and California; but those States get back that same acreage under the 34 percent gadget.

I am trying to say that neither Arizona nor California would lose one acre of production, under the provisions of the amendment. The only State adversely affected by the amendment would be the State of New Mexico, which would lose 11,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say that this bill is written in such a way that if an amendment would change the discrimination visited in one paragraph upon these States, they would regain that acreage by other provisions in other paragraphs of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I only point out that the amendment as now written would cut 11,000 acres from the allotment for the State of New Mexico. The amendment would not touch the acreage in Arizona; it would not touch the acreage in California. It would add approximately 50,000 acres to be divided among all other States.

I point out to certain Senators that I have tried to be fair with reference to this legislative proposal.

I know the Senator from Mississippi tried very hard to have a provision written into the bill concerning total cropland, and he found that I tried my very best to find a legal basis upon which it could be put into the bill. The same statement applies to many other recommendations which came before the committee.

I think it is a little severe to cut 11,000 acres from the allocation for New Mexico, which did not have to have another gadget in order to keep its acreage in line.

If the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to have the acreage given to the States, of Arizona and California reduced, he has to do it by amending the 66 percent gadget.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with great reluctance I withdraw the amendment. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that it was not intended to take 11,000 acres from New Mexico and give it to the historic cotton-producing States; but it was intended to take half of 157,500 acres from California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and reallocate it to the historic States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that was the Senator's intention; but because of the 66 percent limitation, I know the amendment would not affect California or Arizona. It would affect only New Mexico.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from New Mexico has said indicates that in this bill there are gadgets and devices of discrimination beyond those which I thought I had discovered in the limited time available to me to study the bill.

On that basis and on the basis of the withdrawal of this amendment, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD amendment A, the purpose of which would have been to increase the 21 million-acre allocation to a 21,500,000-acre allocation. I shall not urge the amendment at this time. I now ask that amendment A be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. KERR to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, viz: On page 1, line 9, strike the word "twenty-one" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one million five hundred thousand."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I join other Senators who have here expressed the wish that the discriminations in this bill, reinforced and safeguarded by gadgets and language in various provisions of the bill, will be found by the conferees, and that in the conference committee a meeting ground will be found between the provisions of this bill and those of the House bill, that will, in the spirit of real equity and justice, accomplish and be consistent with the principle expressed by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but by finding a different objective than the one he outlined.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself also, along with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was not present to hear previous debate. No doubt there are other Senators with whom I, representing in part the cotton growers of the State of Missouri, would also like to associate myself.

Mr. President, I have a short statement to make with respect to the problem of the cotton growers of Missouri.

Responsible cotton-producer representatives from Missouri and other States have informed me they cannot support the bill in its present form.

They state this bill tends to promote sectionalism; also that thousands of farm families in the old-established cotton-growing areas, such as Missouri, will be penalized at the same time that special acreage is given to Western States. That would seem most unfortunate.

Missouri has a relatively small cotton-growing area—seven counties to be exact; but there are more cotton farms in Missouri than the combined total of cotton farms in 3 large cotton-producing States of the West to which first 157,500 acres, and then 59,000 more, are given.

These 3 States already have an allotment of 1,153,262 acres for 1954. Missouri has an allotment of 391,396 acres.

In other words, Missouri farmers have approximately one-third the allotment per farm as have these western farmers. These same Western States have 108,465 more acres than they had under allotments in 1950.

Missouri, on the other hand, has 71,443 acres less than the 1950 allotment.

Will this shift bring about a need for additional foreign workers to be imported? Figures from the Department of Labor show that in 1952, the latest figures available for a complete year, one Western State imported 22,539 foreign workers, another 57,407, another 19,352.

In 1952, Missouri used 1,790 foreign workers.

Do the western growers need the acreage from the South and the East to provide employment for citizens of other countries?

For the answer to this question I now refer to a telegram received on January 8, last, by the Missouri Cotton Producers Association. This telegram is signed by a Mr. William H. Tolbert, chairman of a western labor users committee. It reads:

Suggest joint resolution Senate and House Agriculture and Appropriations Committees to expand authority of Departments Labor and Justice to continue Mexican national supplementary labor program and supply of funds for activities for remainder fiscal year. California crops in jeopardy due inability to obtain workers now. Appreciate any influence brought on committees involved for affirmative action.

It is my understanding the old growers one time agreed to give up 157,500 acres with the expectation of more reasonable amendments to the current law. These amendments for the old growers are not in S. 2643, and if not inserted, either here or in conference, Missouri would face the same situation later in the year. Missouri cotton producers representatives have been here for days trying to have these amendments included.

Would it not be possible to insert these amendments in the bill; and thereby recognize the serious problems of the little farmers in the old cotton-growing States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has given this bill very long, careful, and painstaking consideration. It is not by any means a perfect bill; but I am in favor of the bill because I believe it is absolutely necessary to have some increase in acreage unless we are to impose tremendous hardships upon the farmers throughout the cotton-growing States.

I opposed some of the provisions of the bill in committee, but after full and detailed discussion on the part of the committee certain amendments were adopted and some others were defeated. Some of them relate to the mechanism of the bill. I think they could very well be taken care of in conference. The subject has been discussed by a number of Senators, who have already spoken to the effect that the conference is the proper place to make certain adjustments. However, I think we should disabuse the public mind of the notion that

this is not a pretty good bill in most respects. The bill has so many features that will help the cotton-growing States that I do not think we could afford to jeopardize its passage by delaying methods or by undertaking to insert amendments which would be destructive of the context of the bill.

I think the committee has done a very good job. I believe that with the possibility of some changes being made in the mechanics of the bill in conference, we can go back to our people and say that this bill represents a distinct improvement over what we would have if we were to allow the present law to apply, with a restriction to 17,910,000 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 2643. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had thought that there was an amendment pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was withdrawn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a statement preparatory to offering an amendment.

The bill as presently written would withdraw approximately 4 million acres of land from the production of cotton but would impose no limit upon the uses to which the 4 million acres of land thus withdrawn might be put.

We know quite well what will happen in the absence of any such limitation. The farmers will naturally be anxious to increase their incomes, and they will use the land for the production, in the main, of other crops. The result will be an increase in the planting and production of soybeans, as well as an increase in the production of soybean oil.

We shall also have an increase in the planting of vegetables, and we shall have an increased quantity of potatoes, lettuce, celery, tomatoes, and so forth. This last may be particularly the case in areas in the West where cotton is grown under irrigation. The acreage withdrawn from cotton will be diverted into other channels.

While we deal with the question of surpluses in cotton, we shall be increasing the problem of surpluses in other commodities. It seems to me that we should deal with this issue in this initial bill, and that we should provide that the acreage which is thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-conserving purposes, and employed in soil-conserving practices. In other words, alternative crops—at least cash crops—should not be planted on the land thus withdrawn, but instead there might be a planting of the nitrogen-fixing plants, the legumes, lespedeza, clover, and alfalfa, in particular, which are soil-building plants taking nitrogen out of the air and putting it into the soil. In many cases, also, this land might be used for pasturage purposes.

I know that if we produce more clover and alfalfa and pasture more cattle, that this will not be a complete withdrawal from use, because it will increase, directly and indirectly, the production of beef cattle and dairy products. But at least we shall be putting something back into the soil, instead of further taking valuable natural elements out of the soil. The entire problem will face us when we come to deal with other farm commodities—when we withdraw, if we do, 16 million acres of wheat land, and when we withdraw many million acres of corn land. The question will arise as to the alternative uses of these soils. If we do not make any attempt whatsoever to deal with this question, what we shall do will be to improve the position of the producers of the so-called basic crops, but worsen the condition of the producers of other crops.

It is in a sense, I think, somewhat shocking that we must deal with the problem of farm surpluses at all, in a world where there is still hunger. I hope very much that we can devise methods to get so-called surplus food products into the stomachs of hungry people, and surplus cotton on the backs of ill-clad people. We obviously now have the problem of what is called overproduction with respect to these commodities, and we are not helping the national interest when we transfer the problem from one crop to another. So, I shall offer an amendment, as an addition to line 23 on page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 23, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That acreage which is withdrawn from the cultivation of cotton in excess of 3 acres per farm shall not be devoted to the production of other cash crops but shall be used for soil-conserving practices such as the growing of legumes and other nitrogen-fixing plants, for the pasturing of cattle, and for other appropriate means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder whether the Senator would be agreeable to adding wheat to his amendment. I believe that ought to be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to have that principle carried out with respect to wheat and corn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Wheat should be added to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The pending bill deals with cotton. When we come to consider wheat and corn I shall be glad to offer such an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that the pending measure contains a wheat amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have already taken care of wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would suggest that we try first to obtain agreement on the amendment which I now offer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Illinois add an amendment providing compensation to the farmer for thus putting his acreage into use and providing a cash income for him and his family, so that there will be adequate incentive to carry out the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that it is necessary at present to give a bonus for that purpose. The use of the proposed practice will build up the soil in itself. We want the South to prosper. We want the position of the cotton grower to be protected. However, we are well aware of the fact that the great increase in the production of soybeans in the South will worsen the position of the Middle West. I am perfectly willing to apply the same principle when we come to a consideration of corn and wheat.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order that the legislative history may be clear, will the Senator agree, after the word "cotton," to add the words "or wheat or corn"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to do so when we consider wheat and corn.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the conferees would understand the meaning of the amendment and would endeavor to work out the purpose of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator says he will be glad to offer such an amendment when we consider wheat. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the pending bill is a wheat bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only by a great stretch of the meaning of the bill that wheat has been tacked on. It is in the form of a vermiform appendix.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such an amendment would certainly be germane.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would change the basic character of the pending bill. It raises some very vital questions which would adversely affect and would certainly have great repercussions upon those whose acreage would be taken out of production. It is not the type of amendment that should go into emergency legislation. A situation has arisen which needs quick attention. If the farmers are to obtain relief, they must get it quickly. I refer to the farmers in the South and in the West. In my opinion, an amendment of this kind would kill the legislation. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the President of the United States in the message which was read to the Senate yesterday recommended that land which is withdrawn from cultivation should be devoted to soil-conservation practices? Is that not correct? I read from his message:

When land must be diverted from production it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, but we have—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can hardly believe it possible that the majority leader should now be opposing on the floor of the Senate a proposal advanced only yesterday by the head of his own administration. It is extraordinary that it falls on the shoulders of Senators on this side of the aisle to take on the armor and do battle for the administration—against its own supposed leaders.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is trying to get a laugh. He knows that the proposal of the President of the United States related to a permanent farm program. We have before us a piece of emergency legislation designed to meet a critical situation in the South and in the West. It is a situation which, if we are to meet it at all, we must do it immediately. The amendment which the Senator offers, for the first time on the floor of the Senate today, has not had the consideration of the committee. It has far-reaching consequences. The Senator from Illinois knows as well as the majority leader this is not the type of amendment that should be added to the bill, and in my opinion, the effect of adding it to the bill would be to kill it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does not conform to the recommendations of the President. The recommendations of the President, as I recall them, were that when the land was taken out of cultivation from one crop and devoted to soil conservation practice, ACB payments should be made. I am sure he recommended payment. The Senator from Illinois is unalterably opposed to any payments being made, as I understand. Therefore, his amendment does not conform to the more liberal recommendations of the President of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Both the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and the proposal of the President of the United States will be given time to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and by the Senate. Such an amendment does not belong on the pending bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote on the cotton-acreage bill there may be inserted in the RECORD messages and telegrams which I have received with reference to that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages and telegrams presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EAST GRAND FORKS, MINN.,

January 11, 1954.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building.

Strongly urge passage of Welker rider providing for use of section 32 funds for diversion of potatoes.

FARMERS CO-OP POTATO MARKETING

ASSOCIATION,

HERMAN SKYBERG, President.

T. P. FREDRICKSON, Manager.

JANUARY 11, 1954.

ROBERT M. GREEN,

Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association, Palatine, Ill.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

PALATINE, ILL., January 8, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni and noodle industry is faced with critical shortage of durum wheat raised in a small section of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. We urge your support of the amendment removing durum acreage allotments in Senate bill 2643 in the best interests of the growers, processors, and consuming public.

ROBERT M. GREEN,

Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

JULE M. WABER,

Chairman Durum Committee, Amber Milling Division, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., January 8, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles for the manufacture of high quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods, and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Milling durum is a highly specialized crop. It is produced only in a small territory in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. The macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that small area for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum acreage in the durum territory should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors that you support the section in Senate bill 2643 dealing with durum acreage allotments.

JULE M. WABER,

Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers National Federation.

Mr. AIKEN. After the bill has been read a third time, I propose to move to

substitute the wording of the Senate bill for the language contained in H. R. 6665. I do not want the bill to be passed before that is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6665.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended so as to read:

An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCHOEPFEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CLEMENTS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2643 will be indefinitely postponed.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that what I have in mind is to bring up the bill for consideration and make it the unfinished business. I would not propose at this hour that the Senate proceed with debate on the measure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with 1 Senator who desires to make more than 2 speeches, but not at length, if the parliamentary situation is such that he may make 2 brief speeches. For that reason, I wish the Senator from California would not make his motion at this time but wait until I can further discuss the question. We should like to make it possible for one of the Senators to make more speeches than he would ordinarily make under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am merely trying to expedite the business of the Senate. For over a week I have given advance notice that we would take up these bills in orderly sequence. There was no attempt to bring them up without prior notice to the Senate. Under the circumstances, we should have unfinished business before the Senate. The orderly procedure would be to bring the bills up, and a Senator could submit a request to make six speeches if he so desired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate I should like to say that I have just had a discussion with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Maryland for whom the Senator from Louisiana had spoken, and it is agreeable to them, as I understand, that the quorum call be dispensed with and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2150, with the understanding that the debate will proceed tomorrow.

I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, which is the only one of the three coinage bills which have not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments at the desk which I desire to call up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, to strike out all in lines 7 through 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such coins shall be disposed of at par by banks or trust companies selected by the Louisiana Purchase One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society."

On page 2, line 24, to strike out "1953" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

On page 3, beginning with the semicolon in line 16, to strike out all through the word "sesquicentennial" in line 19 and add a period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the coinage of a certain number of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. There have been celebrations in States which were originally a part of the Louisiana Purchase territory. The President of the United States participated in these celebrations, as did the Ambassador from France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS REFERRED

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow, but I shall be glad to withhold my motion if there be any further business to be transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate certain nominations, which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued January 19, 1954
For actions of January 18, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 8

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	31	Forest Service.....	15	Property, surplus.....	33,35
Adjournment.....	12	Fruits.....	43	Reclamation.....	3
Claims.....	16	Government operations....	20	Reports.....	6,9,10,16,20
Clover seed.....	14	Health.....	1,38	Research.....	9
Coffee.....	8	Lands, grazing.....	4	Roads.....	27,44
C. C. C.....	6,14,16,34	Loans, farm.....	30	R. E. A.....	19,46
Comptroller General.....	18	Mineral rights.....	5	St. Lawrence seaway....	13,40
Cotton.....	1,28	Missouri Basin.....	23	Soil conservation.....	10,15,16,25
Education.....	22	National parks.....	17	Taxation.....	24
Electrification.....	19,46	Nominations.....	18	Trade, foreign.....	11,43
Extension Service.....	33	Penalty mail.....	47	Transportation.....	36
Farm policy.....	37	Personnel.....	15,18,24,45	Treaties.....	7,21,41
Fiscal policy.....	19	President's message.....	39	Wheat.....	32
Foreign aid.....	43	Prices, support.....	14,26,29,42		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received President's health message. Sen. Williams criticized recent sale of clover seeds for export. Sen. Humphrey criticized removal of Chief and Deputy Chief, SCS, and others, from civil service protection. House sent cotton-allotments bill to conference. Sen. Schoepel inserted Secretary's speech before National Cattlemen's Ass'n. Rep. Wolcott introduced bill to increase CCC borrowing power. Rep. Metcalf introduced bill to stockpile wheat. Rep. Cooley introduced bill to amend Agricultural Act of 1949 re price supports for basics. Rep. Colmer introduced bill to stockpile cotton.

HOUSE

- HEALTH.** Both Houses received the President's health message recommending measures to give the people better health protection (H. Doc. 298) (pp. 311-2, 361-3).
- COTTON ALLOTMENTS.** Rep. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson (Ill.), Bramblett, Dague, Cooley, Poage, Grant Gathings, McMillan, and Abernethy were appointed as conferees on H.R. 6665, providing for cotton acreage allotments for 1954 (p. 367). Senate conferees were appointed on January 12.
Rep. Poage spoke in favor of the House version of the bill (pp. 377-79).
Rep. Jones (Mo.) claimed that the cotton farmer was suffering from the effects of "inaction" of the Secretary when Congress was considering the cotton acreage-allotments bill last session (p. 359).
- RECLAMATION.** Passed without amendment S. 727, to provide that certain costs and expenses in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Willwood, and Belle Fourche Irrigation Districts shall be nonreimbursable (p. 366). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- GRAZING LANDS.** Passed without amendment H.R. 6186, to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal (p. 367).

5. MINERAL RIGHTS. Passed as reported H.R. 3306, relating to the reservation of mineral rights in land patented under the nonmineral land laws (pp. 366-67).

6. CCC. Received from this Department proposed legislation to increase the CCC's borrowing power from \$6,750,000,000 to \$8,500,000,000; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 387).

Received the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1953 (H. Doc. 299) (p. 364).

7. TREATIES. Rep. Javits spoke against Sen. Bricker's proposed constitutional amendment to restrict the President's treaty power (pp. 379-81).

8. COFFEE. Rep. Sullivan urged that steps be taken to stabilize the price of coffee at prices the average consumer can afford (pp. 385-86).

9. RESEARCH. Received from the President the Third Annual Report of the National Science Foundation (H. Doc. 301) (p. 364).

10. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received from this Department the annual report of the operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (p. 387).

11. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a petition from the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, relative to a booklet entitled "Free Trade--A Form of Economic Pacifism" (p. 390).

12. ADJOURNED until Wed., Jan. 20 (p. 387).

SENATE

13. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Continued debate on S. 2150, to create the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (pp. 312-27, 334-48).

14. CLOVER SEED. Sen. Williams criticized the recent sale of clover and vetch seeds for export by the CCC at "a small percentage of their original cost"... "as further evidence of the failure of the rigid high support policies of the past administration" (pp. 310-11).

15. PERSONNEL. Sen. Humphrey criticized as a "backward step" the removal of the Chief and Deputy Chief, SCS, and others, "from under the merit system protection of the civil service," said "there is reason to fear the same thing is threatened for the" U. S. Forest Service Chief, and inserted a Wildlife Management Institute press release on this matter (p. 335).

16. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (pp. 301, 302):
Operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation (H. Doc. 299)
Operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act
The International Claims Commission

17. NATIONAL PARKS. Sen. Humphrey praised the work of the National Park Service and recommended against cuts in its appropriations (pp. 335-6).

deposits of fissionable materials, notwithstanding such person has consented to the reservation of other mineral deposits. If any mineral deposits on account of which the lands were withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable have been leased by the United States such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessor, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act for the protection of the surface rights of entrymen," approved March 3, 1909 (30 U. S. C., sec. 81), is amended to read as follows: "That any person who has in good faith located, selected, or entered under the non-mineral land laws of the United States any lands which subsequently are classified, claimed, or reported as being valuable for coal, may, if he shall so elect, and upon making satisfactory proof of compliance with the laws under which such lands are claimed, receive a patent therefor, which patent shall not contain a reservation to the United States of any mineral deposits other than deposits of fissionable materials, notwithstanding such person has consented to the reservation of other mineral deposits. If any deposits of coal have been leased by the United States such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessor, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That where reclamation homestead entry was made prior to July 17, 1914, pursuant to the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 389, 43 U. S. C., sec. 431), as amended and supplemented, for lands in the Northport Division or the Interstate Division of the North Platte Reclamation Project, and after such entry the lands have been or are hereafter withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable for any of the minerals named in the act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509, 30 U. S. C., sec. 121-123), the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1570, 30 U. S. C., sec. 124), or the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 844, 30 U. S. C., sec. 81), the patent shall not contain a reservation of such minerals. If any such mineral deposits on account of which the lands were withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable have been leased by the United States, such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessee, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JAMESTOWN-WILLIAMSBURG-YORKTOWN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 232) to establish the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that House joint resolution 232 is now Public Law 263, I ask

unanimous consent that it be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

GRANTING PREFERENCE RIGHT TO USERS OF WITHDRAWN PUBLIC LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6186) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 315 (m)) is amended by adding the following proviso: "Provided further, That when public lands are restored from a withdrawal, the Secretary may grant an appropriate preference right for a grazing lease, license, or permit to users of the land for grazing purposes under authority of the agency which had jurisdiction over the lands immediately prior to the time of their restoration."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 43 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 315), is further amended by striking out the following language: "not exceeding in the aggregate an area of 142 million acres."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5529) to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the Battles of Manassas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to establish satisfactory boundaries for the Manassas National Battlefield Park, in the State of Virginia, and to contain within such boundaries the important historic lands relating to the two Battles of Manassas, the boundaries of such battlefield park hereafter shall contain that area which is bounded, in general, as follows: The south boundary of the park shall be the southernmost limits of the present federally owned lands in the south portion of the park; the east and northeast boundaries shall be that portion of the Bull Run Creek which extends from the south boundary of the park north and westward to the north boundary of the park as hereafter prescribed; the southwest boundary shall be that portion of Compton's Lane from its nearest point adjacent to the south boundary and extending northwesterly to State secondary highway No. 622; the west and northwest boundary shall be State secondary highway No. 622, from the point where it connects with Compton's Lane and extending northward until it reaches the Sudley Church property; the north boundary shall be the northernmost limits of the present Federal park holdings in the immediate vicinity of the Sudley Church property. The boundaries of the park also may include not more than 250 acres of land adjacent to the aforesaid west and north

boundaries of the park, which land shall become a part of the park upon acquisition thereof by the United States: *Provided*, That the total acreage which may be acquired for the park pursuant to this act shall not exceed 1,400 acres. Such land or interests therein may be procured by the Secretary of the Interior in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest.

For exchange purposes, particularly in connection with State and other highway developments, the Secretary is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, any non-Federal land or interests therein situated within the park area herein prescribed, and in exchange therefor to convey park land or interests therein of approximately equal value.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the word "hereinafter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, HOEVEN, SIMPSON of Illinois, BRAMBLETT, DAGUE, COOLEY, POAGE, GRANT, GATHINGS, McMILLAN, and ABERNETHY.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. JAMES J. O'ROURKE

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4961, for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$350.95 to Mrs. James J. O'Rourke, of 51 Hopkins Street, Revere, Mass., for reimbursement of the amount of medical and hospital expenses which she incurred after she was admitted to the Revere Memorial Hospital in Revere on February 9, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or re-

ceived by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN SCHLOSSBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000 to Mrs. Lillian Schlossberg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle No. 165460, driven by Lt. Burl J. Brewington, of Fort Jay Army Base, on December 8, 1945, at the intersection of Canal Street and West Broadway, New York, N. Y.; the operator of such vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid, delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$15,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO F. PINDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of Leo F. Pinder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo F. Pinder, regular letter carrier in the United States post office at Akron, Ohio, the sum of \$607.55. Such sum represents the amount which the said Leo F. Pinder was required to pay to the United States in discharge of his liability for the loss on July 31, 1952, of certain registered letters containing money order business and stamp sales money in the amount of \$607.55 which were placed in his custody for delivery from contract station No. 2 to the United States post office in Akron, although he had not received appropriate instructions or equipment for the protection of registered mail matter: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or re-

ceived by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$607.55. Such sum represents the amount" and insert: "\$150, and to be relieved of all liability to refund the sum of \$457.55. Such sums represent the amount."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDNA V. R. DECKER, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, W. S. Rosasco, Jr., and Gordon Wells, as administrator cum testamento annexo of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to each of the following-named persons: Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, W. S. Rosasco, Jr., and Gordon Wells, as administrator cum testamento annexo of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, the sum of \$5,611.56, together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from April 16, 1946, in full satisfaction of the claim of each such person against the United States for an estate-tax refund due as a result of an overpayment on April 16, 1946, of estate taxes with respect to the estate of William S. Rosasco, Sr.: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: Page 2, line 1, after the figures and comma strike out "together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from April 16, 1946."

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, and others."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD K. BUTSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2913) to direct the Secretary of the Interior

to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to Harold K. Butson, of Grant County, Wis., for the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 4 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian, Wisconsin.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The tract of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the said Harold K. Butson of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notified the said Harold K. Butson of the price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the land at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the land by Harold K. Butson or his predecessors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said Harold K. Butson."

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall issue patent for said lands without any reservation of minerals."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which, if passed, will enable each of us to do a better job of representing our constituents.

This bill will relieve us of one of the most time-consuming jobs we perform—that of making recommendations for postmaster appointments, leaving us more time to devote to our primary job—that of legislating. Furthermore, I think that efficient postal service requires that the top job in any post office be something other than a political football.

Section 10 of the Civil Service Act of 1883, which has been ignored for many years, makes it illegal for a Member of Congress to make any recommendation for a postmaster appointment except as to the character or residence of the applicant.

My bill will revive and strengthen that statute by disqualifying any applicant who seeks a recommendation for a postmaster job from any Member of Congress and it will also vest the appointing power in the Postmaster General instead of in the President.

I am not trying to avoid my responsibility but I am trying to improve the postal service and give ourselves more time to act as legislators. I respectfully solicit your support for this legislation.

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a portion of this time not to discuss any personalities or anything that anybody has said about anybody, but rather to discuss proposed legislation that is now pending, affecting the cotton producers of the United States.

I know that many of you will say, "That does not affect me at all." But, there are more farmers producing cotton than any other crop in the United States. Approximately half of all the farmers in the United States produce some cotton. Anything that affects cotton production is of tremendous influence on the economy of the United States.

Some years ago this Congress passed legislation providing for a system of control of cotton acreage, which contains a provision which the Secretary of Agriculture feels—I know there is some dispute about whether it would require him or not—but, at least, he feels it requires him to fix the minimum acreage for the year 1954 at 17,900,000 acres. That is a tremendous reduction from last year's cotton plantings. In 1953, we planted in the United States approximately 26 million acres of cotton. You can readily understand, when you reduce your acreage by more than one-third, what you have done to the income of people who produce that cotton. I know you will say, "Well, you guarantee that farmer will get 90 percent of parity." Yes. You guarantee him that he is going to get 90 percent—nine-tenths of a fair price—for what he produces. He got that last year. He has received more than that for several years past. Now, we are going to take away one-third of his production, but we are not going to increase his price.

We are going to leave that price ten percent below parity and if, perchance, the income of the dwellers of our great cities drops; if, perchance, the wages of our workers drop; if, perchance, the income of our great corporations drops, then that parity is also going to drop because parity is tied to the income of other sections of our country; and the farmers will not even get nine-tenths of a fair price for the two-thirds of a crop which he is going to be allowed to grow.

I hope we all recognize that the farmer is faced with a desperate situation of trying to make ends meet. The Congress authorized limitations on acreage because we recognized that the farmer owed an obligation to carry part of the burden by controlling his production, if he were going to have the assurance that he would get even 90 percent of a square deal. But it does seem that to require a cut of more than 33½ percent at one time is a little more than almost any group can stand.

I do not believe there is a labor union in America that would continue to work if we were to provide that their wages should be cut 33½ percent, or that the time that they could put in each year would be cut 33½ percent.

I do not think there are many of our manufacturers who would continue in business if their income were reduced 33½ percent in one year. Yet that is what we are doing to the cotton farmer.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to point out to the gentleman, as he is well aware, that California, for one State, is being cut 52 percent.

Mr. POAGE. I realize that. The gentleman from California will recall that last summer I was one of those who joined in the passage of a bill by this House that at least sought to ameliorate that condition in California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is to be commended for his efforts in our behalf. I merely wanted to point out that the situation is even more serious in other parts of the country.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman. But I did want him to recall—and the gentleman was present before our committee and we discussed the matter at great length, and there was great difference of opinion as to how far we could go—but the gentleman will recall that I made some strenuous efforts to bring about a compromise, and we did bring about a compromise last summer.

In this House we agreed that there was too much of a cut at one time, that we would not try to go over the precipice all at once, we would not try to step out over the ledge and go clear down to the floor, but that we would build some steps and that we would go down step by step. We agreed that if we had to go down all the way at one time, we might break our leg. We therefore undertook to do this over a period of time. That is what the House of Representatives did. And I think we passed a pretty sound bill. I believe the gentleman from California will agree that it was about as good as we could expect to get. It was not all that he wanted, and it was not all that some others wanted.

Mr. HUNTER. I should like to say to the gentleman, if he will yield to me, that any bill of this type is in the nature of a compromise. It cannot be otherwise, and for that reason, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has said, I agreed to the bill.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is right. What we did was this—and this House of Representatives did it, and did it 5 months before the other body seemed disposed to take any action whatever: We took cognizance of the condition that confronted our farmers. We were not sound asleep here as some of our colleagues at the other end of this Capitol Building supposed. We sent over to the body on the other side, last summer, a bill that raised the acreage allotment, and that bill provided not simply for an increase in acres, but it provided further that when those acres got down to the State, they should go on down to the county and when they had gone down to the county, each county in the United States should have the right to decide for itself whether those additional acres were to be distributed on the county fac-

tor basis; that is, the basis of the percentage of the total number of acres of tilled land that one owned, or whether they should be distributed on the personal history involved; that is, how much cotton the individual had grown previously. As the gentleman knows, there are some sections of this country where it is considered very desirable to distribute cotton acres on the basis of personal history. That is, all of the farmers are not growing cotton. Some of them have grown cotton and have depended on it solely, whereas others are not cotton farmers at all. I can understand that in many of those regions the personal history approach seems to be the better one.

On the other hand, there are vast areas in the United States in which most everybody has been growing some cotton but where almost all the farmers have been following the teachings of the county agents and the rest of the Department of Agriculture, the teachings of diversification, where those farmers have ceased to plant all of their land in cotton and are growing some corn, some feed, some grain, some alfalfa, some livestock, some fruit and vegetables, growing all of these things they were told they should grow. In those sections it would be very harsh indeed to say to those men who have diversified that we are going to penalize you for carrying out the advice all the agricultural experts of the United States Government have been giving you over the years. However, that is what we would do if we should say we would require all of this acreage to be distributed on the basis of personal history.

So the House bill said that the additional acres might be divided at the county level, either on history or on the county factor as the county local committee thought was best for that particular area. I think that is fair and that it is extremely important.

The House bill also provided that if an individual got an allotment he did not need he could turn it back to the county committee for allocation to some other farmer who did need it. I think that was important, too.

I think the House bill give us a reasonable fair approach to this matter.

The other body paid no attention to the House bill and did not act on it. They knew or should have known that there was a referendum coming up in December; that the farmers were going to have to vote as to whether or not they would submit to a reduction of their acreage. Of course, those farmers should have known before they had to vote in that referendum just how much acreage they were going to get. The House of Representatives tried to give them the opportunity of knowing that. I am not making any partisan appeal, but I say Members on both sides of the House supported that bill. There was not a vote against it in the House of Representatives that I can recall. I know there was none in our committee.

The House felt that it had provided a fair compromise between the viewpoints of different sections of the country and a fair way to allow an expression of local opinion. Most of us have

been quite vocal in our statements that we wanted to get the Government back close to the people. There has been no monopoly on those statements on either side of the aisle. We had said that we did not want the Government here in Washington to dictate to the people on matters where they themselves could make their own determination.

So the House bill said that the people in the counties could decide whether they wanted to distribute this cotton acreage on the county factor or personal history basis. I think that is getting it as far back to the people as you can get it.

But the other body did not feel disposed to act. I understand there was one Senator who said he did not want to come back up here to take action on this bill, so he stayed in his State. The committee said that it would not act without their distinguished colleague's presence. So the farmers were required to vote without knowing how much the reduction was to be.

In this session there was a meeting of the committee in the other body. A subcommittee was appointed. That subcommittee met and directed their staff to review the action of some or at least of one of the farm organizations of the country and to bring those suggestions out in bill form. That was done. The bill was reported favorably by the committee before it was introduced. That is right and the record so shows. It was passed by the other body and is now before us.

That bill would increase the acreage allowed to be planted in cotton in the United States. I have no criticism of the action of the other body in reducing the increase that the House provided because we made our increase when we were faced only with an estimate of how much cotton we would grow in 1953. That estimate was slightly over 14 million bales at the time this House acted. Now we know we actually grew over 16 million bales and very properly the other body reduced the increase so that it did not increase the total acreage as much as our bill did.

But then how did they distribute it? And here, to me, is the dangerous thing and the thing of which I think every Member should be aware. That bill from the other body which is now before us provides that all of this increase shall be divided, first, at the State level, so as to go to those farms that do not have at the present time an allotment equal to 65 percent of their average plantings, or 40 percent of their highest plantings at any time in the last 3 years, in no event to exceed 50 percent of their total tilled acreage.

Now that places the distribution on individual history. That means that any man who has been growing a very large proportion of his land in cotton will receive, under the terms of this bill, a substantial increase in his present allotment, and I have no objection to those individuals receiving some help. I understand and appreciate the argument that is made that the man who is geared up to growing cotton has the machinery, the know-how, and the equipment to

stay in business and needs a larger percentage of his land than somebody else does. And he will get it under either bill as I see it, because the House bill makes provision for adjustment of hardship cases, and if his falls in the hardship-case category, certainly he would have the opportunity to receive an adjustment. But the House bill does provide that all of the farmers, all of the cotton farmers of America will get something out of this adjustment. It may not be large, but the House bill would give to John Jones and Henry Smith and to all the rest of the farmers of our country something. But the bill that is proposed by the other body would in many States, at least, give absolutely nothing to a great number of our farmers. In the State of Texas—and I quote Texas because I am familiar with the figures there—this bill would give to Texas, of course, more acreage than any other State, because Texas accounts for nearly 40 percent of the total cotton acreage of this Nation. Texas would get, under the terms of the proposed bill, 1,342,000 additional acres, and that is a lot of cotton. But under the estimates that have been furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, it will require 1,411,000 acres to satisfy this 65-40-50 gadget; in other words, there will not be enough cotton come to Texas to take care of these people who are going to get additional cotton acreage under this gadget. They therefore will get something less than the rest of the farmers of the Nation. They will get, instead of up to 65 percent, maybe up to 60 percent of their average plantings, and maybe up to 37 percent of their highest plantings.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I gladly yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of this body some of the problems that are becoming very apparent in connection with this part of the farm program. As I understand, the gentleman recognizes that when, under strict allocations, you begin to cut back acreage allotments too far, it makes it difficult for the farmers to make a living, because their return is the amount of bales of cotton, whatever it may be, that they have to sell, times the price. That is their return. Of course, the gentleman recognizes, as we all do, that presently we have a year's supply of cotton in the carry-over of the country.

I will not take too much of the gentleman's time, but again I say in all sincerity and honesty I am glad he has brought up this matter, because I think it is going to be constantly before us as we look over this whole farm situation. When you begin to allocate acres, when you restrict, you run into all sorts of alleged inequities and difficulties and sometimes downright discrimination. It is extremely difficult to make allocations as everyone would think that they ought to be made, which, of course, is the thing the gentleman referred to.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I have to agree with the majority leader as to the difficulties that arise. Possibly the only dif-

ference of opinion I have with the majority leader is that I believe we can solve these difficulties. I believe this Congress can do the thing that should be done; in fact, I think this House did do the thing that should be done in regard to cotton. I do not think it is an insoluble problem that is presented to us, although I recognize, as the majority leader points out, it is a difficult problem. However, it is one to which we should devote our best efforts, and not take the defeatist attitude that it cannot be done, and that we have to deny the farmer a living price for his products because of the difficulty of working the problem out.

I fear that the majority leader proposes to lead me into the proposition of saying that I would favor a reduction in the price that is guaranteed to the farmer, but I will accept no such words in my mouth because I think we can very well continue to guarantee the farmer a full 90 percent of parity for his products, requiring of him only his reasonable cooperation in keeping his production within reasonable limits.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly was not trying to put any words in the mouth of the gentleman nor to prejudice his position.

Mr. POAGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon if he was not.

Mr. HALLECK. Everything I said was in good faith. Certainly I do not think that in anything I said the gentleman can find any fair basis for asserting that I for my part believe that the problems cannot be solved, because I believe they can be solved. As to just how we are finally going to do it, that is a matter we can talk about. But certainly what the gentleman has said does point up some of the difficulties involved. That is the reason I said I am glad he brought them up, because it would not hurt us to be thinking about them a little.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the majority leader because I realize it is a difficult problem. It is one to which we have to give our best thought. It is one to which I wanted to direct the thought of this House this afternoon, particularly as to the inequity of the distribution of the cotton acreage under the proposed legislation.

I realize we might talk here for hours about the support program and I realize how essential the support program is. I want to make it clear that I am in favor of 90 percent support for all of the storable basic commodities whenever the farmers of America are willing to bear a share of the burden by making a reasonable and fair reduction in their production.

The question before us now is, What is reasonable and what is fair? I think the other body has very clearly and very fairly fixed the amount of the reduction, but when it comes to distributing those acres they will have failed to give relief to a very large percentage of the cotton farmers, failed to give any

relief to a very large percentage, unless they at least will go far enough to say that we believe in local self-determination at the county level. That is the reason I call the attention of this House now to the basic difference between the approach of the two houses to this important question.

The approach of this body was to leave it to the local people. The approach of the other body is to say that we are going to take care of a group of producers no matter how worthy they may be, a minority group, a small minority of the total, we are going to take care of them in a rather liberal manner, but we are going to do absolutely nothing for the vast majority of the producers.

If any of you anticipate that because you have not so far heard very much about this, that the farmers are not going to be disturbed when they realize what has happened to them, you are due for a rude awakening.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. One of the problems I am sure the gentleman from Texas and the majority leader had in mind was that in south Texas we must plant our cotton in the next few weeks, very much ahead of the rest of the Nation. It is very important for us that the conference committee bring in a report, otherwise we have no relief whatsoever. Relief 2 months from now that might relieve some of the Nation will do us no good whatsoever. Is there any possibility we might get a report in the next day or two?

Mr. POAGE. I recognize the serious problem the gentleman mentions. Yet, I do not think you can hope to get a report in a day or two. The conferees were just recently appointed within the last hour, in fact. There seems to be such a divergency of opinion as to how this should be handled that it would be remarkable if we would get an agreement in a day or two. I can assure the gentleman that the House committee is doing everything it can to get a report out as promptly as possible. We have asked for an immediate conference, but I understand the other body has stated that was impossible. Of course, we have been doing all we could since last spring.

Mr. LYLE. The people of my district have great confidence in your committee, and in the House committee. We hope sincerely that you will advocate our position. We must have a solution within the next few days.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I do not propose to advocate the proposition that we should accept anything in the world that the other body proposes just in order to get legislation, but I can assure my colleague that the conferees on the part of the House are going to try to get a fair bill just as quickly as possible.

Mr. LYLE. I find that we are in the position that if we do not get something, we will have nothing.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, but the House of Representatives gave to the American people, subject to the approval of the other body, last summer legislation which I believe you will agree is fundamentally sound. I do not think

that the responsibility falls on this body to repudiate all that we have done after months and months of work, simply in order to do something that somebody else proposes. It seems to me there is a responsibility elsewhere other than in this House. I propose, of course, to try to get as close to what the House has suggested as is possible. I recognize, of course, that we must make compromises, and I, as one of the conferees, certainly am prepared to make compromises, but I am not prepared to sell out nine-tenths of the farmers in order to give all of the cotton to one-tenth even if it means that nobody gets any cotton. I want additional cotton acres, but I want them fairly apportioned.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman from Texas stated that this bill would give nine-tenths of the additional acreage to one-tenth of the farmers.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to be held to any exact figures because I do not know exactly what the figures are, but I feel that in my section that would probably be substantially correct.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is speaking of the State of Texas and he is not speaking of the entire Cotton Belt south and west; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I am speaking of Texas and, of course, Texas accounts for nearly 40 percent of the Nation's cotton acreage. Any way you figure it, it amounts to a lot of people not getting anything under the bill that is proposed.

Mr. HUNTER. But that is not true of the country as a whole.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure, as I tried to point out that there are many areas where it is highly desirable to use the formula which the other body proposes. I believe the gentleman recognizes, however, that within the State of Texas alone there is the same sort of diversity of situations which exists in the entire Nation, and that some sections of our State would want one formula and some would want another. I certainly have no disposition to impose upon the gentleman from California a formula which might be desirable to my people and would not be desirable to his people. All I am asking is that he give us the opportunity to use either formula we want at the local level because we do have a great diversity of situations and we are simply asking that you give us the right to let the local people determine this rather than to have an edict sent down from Washington.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION ON POWERS OF PRESIDENT REGARDING TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to discuss a question of the gravest import to the foreign policy of

the country which is about to erupt in the country into what is called a great debate. This concerns a proposed amendment to the Constitution known as Senate Joint Resolution 1 proposed by the senior Member of the other body from Ohio, which deals with the powers of the President to be the sole representative of the United States in respect of negotiations on the country's foreign policy. This amendment, I might say, is not confined to the other body. Nine Members of this House have also introduced the same amendment here.

We all know that this is a matter of the most serious discussion in the country today. The House of Representatives has had a growing importance in foreign policy. This House, insofar as it authorizes appropriations and appropriates is very important. In addition to that it had a great deal to do with actually working out the policy of the European recovery and mutual security programs. It, too, should be deeply concerned with this matter.

Now it is claimed on the part of the author of this amendment that it is absolutely essential to the country, because there must be greater restraint upon the President in respect of treaties—and in respect of executive agreements; it is sought, says the author, to prevent their becoming the law of the land—by self operation once approved by two-thirds vote of the Senate—including the law of the separate States as they now do under the Constitution, because it is claimed this gives the President who negotiates such treaties, too much power.

The text of the amendment, with which I believe most Members are familiar, provides that no provision of a treaty shall be domestic law except which is otherwise passed as if it were domestic law in the absence of a treaty. That means that when a treaty is ratified by two-thirds of the other body, according to the Constitution, then that treaty must be implemented by law passed by both the House and Senate and signed by the President, and if it concerns any matter of internal law of any State—and many treaties do—it cannot become law in that State unless that State passes implementing legislation itself in accordance with its own constitutional processes. So that treaties which affect any State internally, and these include treaties of friendship, trade, and commerce; treaties affecting the status of military forces abroad; treaties dealing with taxation to avoid double taxation for Americans doing business abroad and foreigners doing business here; treaties affecting narcotics; and, finally, any treaties affecting the control of atomic energy. As such treaties generally concern questions of land ownership, inheritance, local business, or the practice of the professions, the proposed amendment would make the legislatures of the separate States, in effect, coordinate bodies with the Congress in dealing with the treaty power.

This is a very grave restriction upon the power of the President in foreign affairs. It calls to mind the fact that the Articles of Confederation failed in the period up to 1787 when the Consti-

tutional Convention convened, because of the very imperfections which this amendment proposes to recreate.

I am sure there are many men of great distinction who are back of this amendment and who feel sincerely that it is necessary. But I am deeply convinced, and I think so too are many other responsible people in the country, that if we pass this amendment it would destroy the division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judiciary under the Constitution, and it would be a return to isolationism in a new guise. It would cause the United States, in practical effect, "to secede from the world," which is not my catechism but that of Dean Joseph O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School as quoted from a reply to an inquiry by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I think it is a situation that is of the most vital importance to the country, a situation which is analogous to the Court-packing bill; which was a similar crisis seeking to change the separation of constitutional powers in domestic affairs. I hope that those who oppose this particular amendment will understand its import, as being exactly that serious in terms of foreign affairs.

There have been a number of suggestions of alternatives to satisfy any reasonable fears of supporters of this amendment. One of the suggestions would provide that when a treaty shall be approved by the Senate, the yeas and nays shall be called on it, that it shall not be contrary to anything which is provided in the Constitution and that the judicial power shall extend to such treaty. Another suggestion which I would make myself is the possibility of recognizing the new importance of the House of Representatives, which has grown so much in respect of foreign affairs and changing the Constitution to require treaties to be approved by both Houses, by a two-thirds majority, the same as is now required only of the other body. That treaties are valid only if not contrary to provisions of the Constitution and are subject to the judicial power is now clearly the law but there is no harm in the reassurance of putting it into an amendment.

Neither of these alternatives makes a fundamental change in the separation of powers, whereas the amendment to which I am opposed which is, as I said before, so much a matter of public debate makes a very fundamental change in the constitutional structure of separation of the powers which has endured for 164 years.

Much is made of the fact that a great many distinguished Members, indeed, a majority of the Members of the other body, have their names on this proposal. That is always advanced as a very important reason why it is a good proposal. I think it is to be hoped that it will soon be made clear what is the actual support for this amendment and what is the support of the idea either of just discussing the suggestion, or of crystallizing existing law for the purpose of reassuring a great many people who are worried about it.

The responsibility of world leadership by the United States is so great, and this

issue is at such a high pitch of discussion, that Members of Congress should as soon as possible no longer leave the free world in doubt as to this particular amendment.

Before we take up other particular objections to it, I should like to take a minute to deduce what we can from the papers as to why this amendment is suddenly brought in. As I see it, it has three reasons. First, a new fear of the United Nations. This is frankly stated by the majority report of the Judiciary Committee in the other body which says that the United Nations, they believe, is preparing to propose to all of its members, including the United States, some 200 separate treaties dealing with many diverse questions of domestic jurisdiction and that therefore this amendment is being set up as a new safeguard to prevent anything being imposed upon the United States.

Another argument which is made is that the examples of the executive actions at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran in connection with World War II make it necessary to have some greater restraints in foreign affairs put upon the President.

The third argument made is that in a case decided in 1920, some 34 years ago—Missouri against Holland—the Supreme Court said that a treaty could control a matter of domestic law within a State and that it would be paramount. So it is implied that the Senate could approve some treaty which the President had made changing the Constitution, changing our form of government, or impairing the Bill of Rights.

To start back from that last argument, the Supreme Court has said specifically, as long ago as 1890—Geoffrey against Riggs—that no treaty may be made which is contrary to anything which is stated in the Constitution. That is clear and unequivocal. The Secretary of State and the President have both stated that that is their interpretation, and so has the Attorney General. I do not think there can be any question about that. I think that the contrary is just a "hobgoblin" that is raised in this particular situation.

As to Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, the argument that has been made by many people on this subject is that there were secret arguments and that they have worked out mischievously. But there is nothing in the amendment which we are discussing, there is nothing in any amendment which we can draw unless we are ready to reduce the powers of the Presidency to those held by an executive such as the President of France—which has, however, the parliamentary form of government—unless we are ready to do that, there is nothing in this amendment that could stop any President from making a secret agreement; and if the Congress would approve an improvident agreement that Congress would have to have its head examined, but as the law stands now it could repudiate it, and that repudiation is effective now without any amendment.

There is nothing to prevent the Congress—and the cases on this are very clear—from passing a resolution repudiating any secret agreement and de-

claring that it is not law in the United States, whether made at Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran, or elsewhere.

Finally, as to what the United Nations is trying to do. If it tries to do something which the American people are for, the Congress would approve it. And if it tries to do something which the American people are against, the Congress could disapprove it.

We have had enough struggles with respect to treaties, including the turn-down of the League of Nations after World War I to know that when the public is aroused, no one is going to impose upon the people of the United States.

Let us look at the other side for a minute and see the errors which are involved in this amendment.

In the first place, it would tie the President's hands in negotiations with foreign governments at a time when we have elected a new President in whom we have the greatest measure of confidence on this issue, at a time when we do not want a world war III and want to carry on negotiations to avoid it. Just when we need an Executive who has power which the Constitution gives him, and when we have an Executive in whom the great majority have full confidence on foreign policy, this amendment proposes to take away the power.

The fact that this amendment is taken so very seriously in our country is itself a factor in world negotiations with respect to bringing about peace through the U. N., regional organization and the control of the atom. It tends to give support to an argument that the spirit of isolation is not dead in this country which we thought for all political purposes it was but a short time ago. I think it is a very inopportune time to bring up this amendment.

In one further point about the need for implementing legislation in order to make a treaty effective which this amendment would introduce. Today a treaty becomes effective when the other body approves it, it becomes effective as domestic law unless contrary to the Constitution. But the Congress may by law invalidate and denounce any treaty at any time that it passes a bill to that effect and the President signs it or it is passed over his veto.

Under the plan proposed in this amendment we will have five separate steps to get anything done about a treaty. The President must make the treaty, the other body must approve it, then both bodies must implement it, then the President has the right to say that he does or does not want the implementation, and finally both Houses have the right to pass it over his veto. This our negotiators say will hamstring our efforts to negotiate with other countries of the world on matters which are so essential to be negotiated today. I need not describe to you in greater detail, also, the mischief and havoc the amendment can work by leaving open to question whether a treaty is effective unless 48 separate State legislatures pass implementing legislation to that effect.

The amendment also gives Congress power in advance to regulate executive agreements. These are very numerous and are concerned with many details as

or violence, violating sections 2387 or 2388 which relate to acts involving the morale, loyalty, and discipline of the Armed Forces.

A violation of each and every one of those sections of title 18 of the United States Code involves activities that are in and of themselves hostile and injurious to our Government. Those actions evince a criminal intent on the part of the perpetrators to betray the Government of the United States and so violates their allegiance to this Government. A combination of such acts and criminal intent can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that such a person has renounced his allegiance to the Government of the United States.

By requiring that the citizen must have been found guilty of one of these crimes by a court of competent jurisdiction before the additional penalty of loss of nationality can be imposed my bill adheres to those fundamental principles of American criminal jurisprudence such as a fair trial, the presumption of innocence, and all the other safeguards of a defendant's rights.

Under the provision of my bill the loss of nationality would be automatic after the conviction. By predicating the grounds for loss of nationality upon specific sections of title 18 of the United States Code any problems of unconstitutionality for vagueness or generality are obviated. Then, too, the need for any additional litigation is avoided.

There may be some who might question the constitutionality of this bill particularly as it applies to native-born citizens. The question is asked, "Does Congress possess the power to revoke the nationality of a native-born citizen?"

I have no fear in that regard. Under my bill Congress does not revoke the nationality of a native-born citizen, instead Congress merely recognizes the right of expatriation and defines the acts to effect it.

Congress recognized the right of expatriation in 1868: It is the voluntary renunciation or abandonment of nationality or allegiance to this Government that had been acquired at birth.

This doctrine of expatriation is not new to this Government. I refer to the Civil War Statute—Revised Statutes, section 1996—1865:

All persons who deserted the military or naval service of the United States and did not return thereto or report themselves to a provost marshal within 60 days after the issuance of the proclamation by the President, dated March 11, 1865, are deemed to have voluntarily relinquished and forfeited their rights of citizenship, as well as the rights to become citizens and such deserters shall be forever incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the United States, or of exercising any rights of citizens thereof.

In 1907 Congress enacted a general expatriation statute—34 Statute, page 1228. Today, section 349 (a), paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10, of the Immigration and Nationality Act provide for loss of nationality by such acts as the making of a formal written renunciation of nationality in time of war, desertion in time of war, acts of treason, or attempts to overthrow the United States by force or

bearing arms against it and by departing from or remaining outside the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or national emergency in order to avoid military service. The same acts were formerly found in the Nationality Act of 1940—8 United States Code, page 801.

If one keeps clearly in mind that the loss of nationality results from voluntary action of a renunciative nature by the citizen himself in conformity with applicable principles—and is not a revocation of nationality by Congress itself—the fear of unconstitutionality should abate.

Those criminals whose very crimes subvert their allegiance to our form of government and at the same time weaken our national security should forfeit the rights and privileges of the citizenship which they have betrayed. No avenue should be left open to them to pursue their schemes as citizens. All opportunity for them to pursue their subversive activities should be blocked.

My bill will effectuate such objectives with dispatch, under a procedure that is consistent with those rights and privileges conferred upon these traitors by the very Constitution and Government which they seek to destroy.

My bill is designed to preserve and protect the Government from the traitorous acts of those who seek to destroy it while at the same time it permits the self-destruction of the nationality—including the rights and privileges—of those who betray their allegiance to it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

STABILIZING FARM PRICES

(Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today covers dairy products and other livestock products, as outlined in the first two farm bills that I introduced last week. In addition, this third bill, H. R. 7267, applies the same principles to certain other major farm commodities. Enactment of this bill, along with the others, would give the Nation a farm program of definite action to stabilize farm income and prices at not less than 100 percent of parity.

These bills would provide support to farmers when support is needed. My bills do not authorize the sliding scale. I do not think farmers in my district want the sliding scale. I do not think the sliding scale, variable price-support theory will work.

None of the large industrialists, who manufacture the goods that farmers

buy, have put any sliding scale on their asking prices during this period of falling farm income. Farm machinery products have been cut, but machinery prices are just as high as they have ever been.

The dairy farmer has had some experience with the sliding scale this past year. Prior to April 1, 1953, he was faced with the uncertainty that supports might be dropped to the bottom of the support scale—now set at 75 percent of parity by law. Although 90 percent of parity supports for milk and butterfat were supposed to be put into effect, the dairy farmer in my district—and in most of the rest of the country—has realized a return of only 84 percent of parity. If the announced supports were dropped to 75 percent next April 1, and the program should be administered as now, the farmer would get only 64 percent of parity. Sliding-scale supports are not good for farmers, and in general they are not good for the public.

Farmers who produce other farm commodities cannot afford to allow the variable sliding scale to go into effect any more than the dairy farmer can. If we allow the sliding scale the opponents of adequate farm price supports will seek to drive wedges between the producers of different farm commodities. They will urge different programs for different commodities. In self-protection, farmers must pull together. President Eisenhower has recommended a good wool program. My bills, including H. R. 7267, which I have introduced today, would apply the same principle, at 100 percent of parity, to all major farm commodities.

These bills present a complete price support behind which all farmers can rally. These bills would require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide 100 percent of parity by methods that would reflect the support directly to farmers in markets where they sell. Also, they would not allow the benefits of the support program to get lost in the brokerage houses in Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York.

SITUATION OF COTTON FARMERS OF AMERICA

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that the cotton farmers of America are suffering from the effects of inaction, lack of policy, absence of recommendations, and lack of cooperation on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture last July or on the first day of August when Congress was attempting to pass a bill to give additional acres which are badly needed. It seems to me it took the Secretary from July to October or December to realize the condition of the cotton farmers of this Nation. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture will be a little more prompt in recognizing the plight of the farmer, be more sympathetic to, and will also offer more cooperation than he has offered in the past.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS ADVISORY BOARD

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therewith copy of the bill H. R. 6900.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II the American people have expressed a concern and expended their resources for the achievement and maintenance of international peace and security to a degree unsurpassed in the annals of history. In this process the President of the United States has the primary role, since he is charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs. While it is true that the Secretary of State is the right arm of the President in fulfilling this responsibility, the President secures his advice from many agencies of the Government and from private sources. Some of the agencies involved in advising the President are in turn advised by special commissions, boards, and private agencies.

However, the widespread mechanism of executive branch and outside advice to the President on foreign affairs lacks cohesion, continuity, and, in a sense, it lacks nonpartisanship. To remove these obstacles and deterrents to effective international leadership by the United States, on the first day of this session I introduced a bill, H. R. 6900, establishing a Foreign Affairs Advisory Board of nine members appointed by the President with Senatorial confirmation, whose function it will be to make a continuing study and evaluation of international conditions for the purpose of advising and consulting with the President. They will devote their full time to this task. Responsible world leadership demands the establishment of this Board.

I hope favorable action will be promptly taken on the measure during this session of the Congress.

H. R. 6900

A bill to provide for the establishment of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Board

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist the President in conducting the foreign affairs of the United States, to establish continuity of foreign policy, and to provide a reliable source of information concerning the foreign affairs of the United States for officers of the Government and the public at large, there is hereby established the Foreign Affairs Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Board to make a continuing study and evaluation of conditions in the United States and abroad which affect the foreign affairs of the United States, and to advise and consult with the President to assist him in formulating the foreign policy of the United States and in conducting the foreign affairs of the United States.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of 9 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, solely on the basis of their knowledge, ability, and experience in the field of foreign affairs and international affairs generally. No member of the Board shall be less than 40 years of age.

(b) The members of the Board shall serve for terms of 18 years, except that the 9 members first appointed shall serve for terms of 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 years, respectively, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(c) (1) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Board shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(3) Any vacancy existing in the membership of the Board for more than 1 year shall be temporarily filled by majority action of the remaining members of the Board. Such temporary appointee shall serve until an appointment is made as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(4) Upon the expiration of his term of office a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and takes office.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of State shall be an ex officio member of the Board, and shall at his pleasure preside at its meetings.

(b) The Board shall select one of its members who shall serve as its chairman and preside at all meetings not presided over by the Secretary of State.

(c) The Board shall meet at regular intervals (not less often than once each month), and at such other times as the Board may decide and as the President may direct.

(d) Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$25,000 a year, and shall in addition be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Board.

STAFF OF THE BOARD

SEC. 6. The Board shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

POWERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) The Board, or any member thereof when so directed by the Board, may, for the purpose of carrying out the duties vested in the Board by this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Board or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board or before such member.

(b) The Board is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, independent establishment, or other instrumentality such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as it may re-

quire in carrying out its duties under this act; and each such department, agency, independent establishment, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Board upon request therefor made by the Board.

EXPENSES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

WHY WON'T STATE DEPARTMENT TRY TO EFFECT RELEASE OF GI'S AND CIVILIANS ILLEGALLY HELD PRISONER BY THE REDS?

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when our State Department was not afraid to demand the release of one American illegally held as a prisoner by any nation.

Now it appears to consider many as mere pawns in the game of power politics.

It is estimated that 944 Americans who fought for our country and were taken prisoner by the Chinese Communists have been conveniently forgotten by their own Government.

Plus an undetermined number of American civilians.

Can it be that the improvisers of our foreign policy are so weak, timid, or confused that they have lost sight of moral values in dealing with the international aggressors?

The silence of the State Department, and its refusal to speak up for all Americans who are held by the Russians and the Chinese on trumped-up charges, is a source of disappointment and dismay to an increasing number of people in the United States.

We may debate the point of trade-not-aid in the economic field, but we bitterly oppose its extension to diplomacy. Americans held behind the Iron Curtain against their will in violation of the Korean truce terms, or stripped of the protection they are entitled to from the Government of the United States, are not surplus commodities to be dumped and abandoned. The State Department will not aid them. This emboldens the Communists in the belief that they can trade back these missing men at a price—the dishonorable and costly price of admitting the aggressor, Red China, into the United Nations, or for other concessions to Soviet Russia.

Where are the rights of these men, when both sides consider them as mere bargaining points?

As the moral, as well as the material leader of the free world, it is our duty to work unremittingly for the release of our own citizens, and for the release of non-Russians and non-Chinese who are kept captive without a shred of legality.

Anxious relatives and friends in the United States pray for some sign of leadership by our Government to give them hope that these victims of involuntary servitude will regain their freedom.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued January 21, 1954
For actions of January 20, 1954
83rd-2nd, No.10

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10	Labor, farm.....19	Retirement.....8,20
Auditing.....6	Legislative program.....10	R. H. A.....1
Coffee.....15,28	Loans, farm.....19	St. Lawrence seaway...1,27
Committee expenditures.....6	Meat.....24	Section 32.....11
C. C. C.....1	Nomination.....4	Social security.....5
Cotton allotments.....11	Personnel.....8,13,20,32	Statehood.....23
Dairy products.....30	Prices, farm.....3	Storage facilities.....21
Electrification.....9	food.....3	Surplus food.....1
Farm policy.....25	support.....3,30	Surplus property.....12
Food control.....31	Property.....22	Taxation.....21,22
Foreign aid.....24	Reclamation.....33	Trade, foreign.....14
Forest compact.....17	Reports.....6,12	Treaties.....7,26
Fruits and vegetables.....21	Research.....4	Wheat.....6,11
Health.....16,29		

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on cotton-allotments bill. Sen. Humphrey favored 90% price supports and claimed merchants were concerned over falling farm prices. Sen. Morse recommended development of program to dispose surplus foods to charity. Senate passed St. Lawrence seaway bill. Rep. Hope and Sen. Hayden, and others, introduced resolutions on Mexican farm-labor supply. Rep. King (Pa.) introduced bill providing tax amortization deductions on fruit and vegetable storage facilities.

SENATE

1. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Passed with amendments, 51 to 33, S. 2150, to create the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (pp. 484-5, 591-5, 505-42).

During the debate on this measure, Sen. Aiken pointed out that the proposed corporation would not establish a precedent in the respect that it would require a borrowing corporation to come to Congress yearly for appropriations, and said that the CCC "is given borrowing power, which it uses; and then, I believe quite improperly, the notes to the Treasury are canceled" (p. 509). In this connection, Sen. Ferguson discussed the borrowing and lending authority of the REA (p. 510).

Sen. Humphrey inserted an American Farm Bureau resolution favoring enactment of this bill (pp. 468-9).

2. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Morse opposed placing surplus food in storage, "thus removing it from consumption," and recommended that the Administration develop a program whereby charitable institutions will be given adequate quantities of surplus foods (p. 485).
3. PRICE SUPPORTS; FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey favored 90% price supports, claimed that Minnesota businessmen were concerned over falling farm prices, and insert-

ed a Thief River Falls (Minn.) newspaper advertisement signed by leading merchant urging Congress to "try to establish 100 percent of parity" and other articles on farm and food prices (p. 483).

4. **NOMINATION.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee ordered favorably reported (but did not actually report) the nomination of L. M. Gould to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation (p. D38).
5. **SOCIAL SECURITY.** Sen. Humphrey inserted his statement praising the President's social security message (pp. 482-3).
6. **REPORTS.** Received reports from various Senate Committees, including the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, ^{on committee personnel} and expenditures therefor (pp. 469-75).
Received the report of Government Operations Committee on Audit Reports of Government Corporations and Agencies (S. Rept. 861) (p. 469).
Received the Agriculture and Forestry Committee's report on hearings held in Minneapolis, Minn., and Galveston, Tex., on the importation and disposition of Canadian wheat classified as "wheat unfit for human consumption" (S. Rept. 862) (p. 469).
7. **TREATIES.** Sen. McCarran spoke in favor of S. J. Res. 1, (the Bricker amendment) to restrict the President's treaty power and in opposition to Sen. Knowland's substitute therefor (pp. 495-505).
Sen. Lehman inserted a Young Republican Club of New York resolution opposing S. J. Res. 1 (p. 469).
8. **PERSONNEL; RETIREMENT.** Sen. Williams discussed a "major loophole in our retirement laws" and he urged that this loophole be closed by legislation (pp. 490-1).
9. **ELECTRIFICATION.** Sen. Morse inserted three newspaper articles favoring an initiative proposed by the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, Inc. which provides for a commission empowered to take over the facilities of privately-owned utilities and develop new resources (pp. 517-8).
10. **RECESSED** until Fri., Jan. 22, 1954 (p. 543). The **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM** as announced by Majority Leader Knowland: Fri., Jan. 22, calendar; Mon., Jan. 25, considers various nominations, and Korean mutual defense treaty, and "either on Tuesday or Wednesday...the Senate will be prepared to debate Senate Joint Resolution 1," and this measure was made the unfinished business (pp. 511-2, 542-3).

HOUSE

11. **COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS.** Received the conference report on H. R. 6665, providing for cotton acreage allotments for 1954 (pp. 462-5, 466). As reported by the conferees the bill would provide a total national cotton ~~acreage~~ allotment of 21,379,342 acres for 1954 instead of the 22,672,700 acres agreed to by the House originally; would permit the Secretary to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas to classes of wheat determined to be in short supply; and would permit section 32 funds to be used in operations with respect to Irish potatoes. The report states: "The legislation...adopts, subject to certain modifications, the Senate bill's emergency provisions for the 1954 crop and accepts, with some revisions, the House bill's provisions of a permanent nature relating to acreage allotments and quotas for the long range cotton program." In part the conferees:
"Accepted a proposal that any part of the county allotment heretofore established from the 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop, which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitations in the Act, shall be available to the State Committee and used to provide additional apportionments to farms!"

"Agreed to an amendment in the Senate bill to provide that unused acreage allotments heretofore established for extra long staple cotton could be released and reapportioned in the same manner provided for upland cotton."

"Accepted the long range features of the House bill that provide that the State acreage reserve shall be used in addition to the uses to which such reserve may be put under existing law, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships. Provision is also made to permit the use of county reserve in adjusting farm allotments to correct inequities and prevent hardships."

12. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Received from this Department an annual report regarding the disposal of foreign excess property (pp. 465-6).
13. PERSONNEL. Rep. George claimed that many of the personnel added to Federal service in the last 20 years had been blanketed into civil service without competitive examinations (p. 433).
14. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Bailey spoke against the Committee for a National Trade Policy, claiming its purpose is to "propogandize" for further reduction in tariffs (pp. 432, 461-2).
15. COFFEE. Rep. Kersten urged that the basic facts behind the rising cost of coffee be ascertained (p. 431).

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. HEALTH. S. 2778, by Sen. Smith, H. J., (for himself and others), to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 475). Remarks of Sen. Smith (pp. 476-7.)
17. FOREST COMPACT. S. 2786, by Sen. Sparkman (for himself and others), to grant the consent and approval of Congress to the Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 476). Remarks of Sen. Sparkman (pp. 478-9.)
18. FARM LABOR. S. J. Res. 121, by Sen. Hayden (for himself and others), and H. J. Res. 355, by Rep. Hope, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; to Agriculture Committees (pp. 467, 476).
19. FARM LOANS. H. R. 7377, H. R. 7378, and H. R. 7379, by Rep. Edmondson, and H. R. 7391, and H. R. 7392, by Rep. Teague, to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, of 1944, as amended, to make direct housing loans to veterans; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 466).
20. PERSONNEL. H. R. 7372, by Rep. Broyhill, to provide cost-of-living pay adjustments for officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949...; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 466).
H. R. 7373, by Rep. Celler, to preserve the right to removal procedures in the case of certain officers and employees in positions excepted from the classified civil service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 466).
H. R. 7381, by Rep. Jenkins, to provide that failure of any officer or employee of the United States to answer certain questions shall result in removal from his position or office; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 466).

H. R. 7386, by Rep. Perkins, to amend Section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that \$150 per month of retirement income shall be nontaxable; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 466).

21. STORAGE FACILITIES. H. R. 7382, by Rep. King, Pa., to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend to fruit and vegetable storage facilities the same amortization deduction now provided for grain storage facilities; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 466).
22. FEDERAL PROPERTY. H. R. 7401, by Rep. Hoffman, Mich., to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense-production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 467).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. ALASKA STATEHOOD. Extension of remarks by Rep. Engle urging Congressmen to sign his petition to discharge the House Rules Committee from further consideration of this bill (p. A403).
24. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Rees inserted a newspaper editorial, "Meat for England" claiming England is getting our surplus meat for a nominal price under the Mutual Security Act but continues to trade with Russia "on what amounts to a cash basis" (p. A408).
25. FARM POLICY. Rep. Blatnik inserted a Democratic Digest article, "Farmers and Consumers Hurt by Two-Way Price Stretch" (pp. A428-9).
26. TREATIES. Sen. Kilgore inserted a Walter Lippman article and Sen. Wiley inserted a group of letters and telegrams opposing Sen. Bricker's proposed constitutional amendment to restrict the President's treaty power (pp. A361-2, A393-4).
27. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Martin inserted two newspaper editorials and a letter opposing this project, and Sen. Green inserted an editorial praising Sen. Kennedy for favoring this project (pp. A367, A370).
28. COFFEE. Extension of remarks by Rep. Smith (Wis.) urging a voluntary coffeeless Wednesday to combat the rising cost of coffee (pp. A367-8).
29. HEALTH. Rep. Wolverton inserted newspaper editorials praising the President's proposed health program, and an article by Dr. Evarts Graham "The Right to Health--A New Concept" (pp. A377-8, A386-7).
30. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Laird inserted a newspaper editorial favoring his view that "whatever program of price supports is finally adopted, dairy products should be supported under the same system as other major commodities" (p. A378).
31. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Smith (Miss.) inserted a newspaper editorial approving the decision of the Advisory Committee on Army Organization that the Corps of Engineers should retain its flood control and other civil functions (pp. A381-2).
32. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks by Rep. Mos's urging that the Civil Service Commission should remove the "cloud of doubt hovering over the hundreds of thousands of loyal employees of the Federal Government" by publicly clarifying the 1,456 security firings, and he inserted a newspaper article on this subject (pp. A410-1).

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

JANUARY 20, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6665]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:*

“(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) The national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton shall be increased to twenty-one million acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A) three hundred and fifteen thousand additional acres shall be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half being made to the States participating therein on the basis of their respective shares of the increased national acreage allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as may be required to provide each State a total allotment under subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The addi-

tional acreage made available to States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this paragraph (1) shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, and the additional acreage shall be apportioned to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided, That, if the county committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional county allotment among farms in the county, the additional acreage shall be apportioned by the county committee to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: Provided, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the county; if the additional acreage available to the county is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed the acreage remaining after making such increases shall be allotted to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) (3). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, if the State committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph (1) it shall apportion such additional allotment directly to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: Provided, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary: Provided, That if the State total of the farm increases so computed exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. Before apportioning such unallotted acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion*

such unallotted acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section. Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"(2) Any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment transferred under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned under this paragraph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county in determining future acreage allotments. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply also to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than one hundred thousand acres but more than thirty thousand acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 per centum of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton."

SEC. 2. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In any county in which a major flood control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest."

SEC. 3. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended, effective beginning with the 1955 crop, as follows:

(a) By striking the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(b) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon before the word "Provided" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship:".

(c) By adding a new paragraph "(6)" at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such three year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3)."

SEC. 4. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any class or sub-class of wheat that a substantial difference exists in the usage or marketing outlets therefor and that the supply of such wheat for the 1953-54 and 1954-55 marketing years with respect to the 1954 crop, and for the 1954-55 and 1955-56 marketing years with respect to the 1955 crop, will be substantially short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements for such wheat for such marketing years, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such crop of wheat for farms which produced such wheat in one or more of the preceding three years to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage seeded to such class or sub-class of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, and shall not be used to increase the acreage allotment applicable to other wheat produced on farms for which such additional acreage has been allotted, nor shall such acreage be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes" (7 U. S. C. 1450), is amended by inserting

at the end thereof the following: "Operations with respect to Irish potatoes authorized by section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes' (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446)."

(b) The parenthetical phrase contained in the sentence preceding the last sentence of section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" (7 U. S. C. 612c), is amended to read as follows: "(other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
JNO. L. McMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
|BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
KARL E. MUNDT,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,
HERMAN WELKER,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing positions of the two Houses on H. R. 6665, as originally passed by the House and as amended by the Senate, relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The conference substitute relates to cotton, Durum wheat, and Irish potatoes.

It should be pointed out to the House, prior to a discussion of the agreement reached by its conferees, that the House on July 31, 1953, passed H. R. 6665, intended to deal not only with the special problems in 1954, but also to perfect and facilitate the operation of the cotton acreage allotment and marketing quota program in subsequent years. The House action occurred prior to the allocation of the 1954 national cotton acreage allotment and the referendum of December 15, 1953, under present law. The legislation was sent to the Senate, where action was taken January 12, 1954, in the manner of a substitute for the House bill, dealing only with the emergency acreage allotment problems for the 1954 cotton crop, and with Irish potatoes and special class of wheat. Meanwhile, in the interim of the action between the two Houses, a cotton crop had been harvested which exceeded by approximately 2 million bales the estimate on the 1953 crop that was available to the House when it acted upon H. R. 6665.

The legislation agreed upon by the committee of conference, presented in this report, adopts, subject to certain modifications, the Senate bill's emergency provisions for the 1954 crop and accepts, with some revisions, the House bill's provisions of a permanent nature relating to acreage allotments and quotas for the long-range cotton program.

The primary purpose of the legislation, agreed upon in conference, is to provide for adjustments to facilitate a reduction in the production of cotton for 1954 without causing unnecessary hardships, and to revise the basic legislation in a manner to facilitate necessary adjustments in the future.

Except for clarifying minor changes, the substitute bill agreed upon by the conferees is explained below.

SECTION 1—COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The first paragraph of this section embraces the Senate provision increasing the national acreage allotment for the 1954 cotton crop to 21 million acres and apportioning this acreage to the States in the

same manner in which the 17,910,448 national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, the legislation agreed upon provides 315,000 additional acres of allotment to be apportioned, one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico and one-half to the other cotton-producing States, these two prorations to be made to the States sharing therein, other than those receiving the minimum allotments under subsection 344 (k), on the basis of their respective shares of the 21-million-acre national acreage allotment. Furthermore, the legislation provides that no cotton-producing State shall receive a total allotment of less than 66 percent of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The Senate conferees accepted an amendment proposed by the House conferees that such acreage, under the 66-percent guaranty to each State, would to the extent planted not go into the State history of cotton plantings for purposes of computing future State cotton acreage allotments. The effect of this paragraph is to set a total national cotton acreage allotment of 21,379,342 acres for 1954. H. R. 6665 as passed by the House would have set a national allotment at 22,672,700 acres.

Set out below is a table showing the manner in which the additional acreage allotments provided by the bill agreed upon by the conferees would be apportioned among the States:

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage ¹	1953 acreage in cultivation, July 1	1954 State acreage allotments, 17,910,448	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres ²	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average ³		State acreage added by reason of 66-percent provision ⁴	State acreage added by reason of 15-percent provision	Proposed State acreage allotments
					157,500	157,500			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	Acres 1,605,000	Acres 1,630,000	Acres 1,139,121	Acres 1,335,690	Acres 10,711	Acres 39,362	Acres 36,495	Acres -----	Acres 1,346,401
Arizona	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958	-----	-----	-----	-----	413,815
Arkansas	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,683	-----	-----	-----	1,847,036
California	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220	-----	95,298	22,879	-----	936,397
Florida	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,837	311	-----	-----	4,968	44,116
Georgia	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458	-----	-----	-----	1,188,894
Illinois	2,750	2,400	5 4, 000	5 4, 000	-----	-----	-----	-----	5 4, 000
Kansas	35	-----	5 80	5 80	-----	-----	-----	-----	5 80
Kentucky	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86	-----	-----	-----	10,799
Louisiana	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466	5,970	-----	-----	-----	750,436
Mississippi	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,739,641	2,063,288	16,545	-----	-----	-----	2,079,833
Missouri	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681	-----	-----	-----	462,617
Nevada	1,950	2,000	5 2, 289	5 2, 289	-----	-----	-----	-----	5 2, 289
New Mexico	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102	-----	22,840	-----	-----	218,942
North Carolina	765,000	781,000	598,638	619,860	4,971	-----	-----	-----	624,831
Oklahoma	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547	8,736	-----	-----	-----	1,098,283
South Carolina	1,160,000	1,181,000	736,006	921,640	7,390	-----	-----	-----	929,630
Tennessee	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268	5,415	-----	-----	-----	680,683
Texas	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361	-----	-----	-----	8,719,178
Virginia	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172	-----	-----	-----	21,682
United States	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

¹ Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.

² Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in col. (3).

³ 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base one to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.

⁴ Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

⁵ Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

Prepared by: Cotton Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA.

Two alternative formulas are provided for apportioning the acreage made available to States under the provisions of paragraph (1), as follows:

(a) After the additional acreage is apportioned to the States, if the State committee determines that such action will result in more adequately correcting individual farm allotment hardship cases for 1954, this additional acreage may be distributed directly to farms so as to provide—to the extent the acreage will permit—each eligible farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any 1 of these 3 years, but with a provision that each State may decide upon a cropland percentage limitation as to the total acres that may be allotted under this provision to an individual farm.

(b) The additional State allotment may go directly to counties on the basis of their respective allotment shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned, and the county committee may decide to use either (1) the county cropland factor procedure or (2) the 65-40 procedure described above.

In the Senate amendment, the additional acres allotted to a farm could not bring the total farm allotment to more than 50 percent of the total cropland on the farm. Because of differences in farming practices in different States, the committee of conference decided to leave the final determination of this figure to the State committees, but not to exceed 50 percent of the cropland. The language in the conference substitute will permit each State committee, taking into consideration certain factors, to determine the figure for that State. This will for example permit the Western States—California, Arizona, and New Mexico—if their State committees so determine, to fix the maximum at 50 percent, while the Eastern States, some of which prefer a 40 percent maximum, can adopt that figure or any other less than 50 percent which the State committee may determine.

If the additional acreage allotted a State is not sufficient to provide the proposed increases in farm allotments in full, by use of formula (a), all the proposed farm increases would be reduced proportionately. If the additional acreage allotted the State is more than sufficient, the excess would first be used to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in section 344 (f) (1) of the act, as amended.

The conference committee accepted a proposal that any part of the county allotment heretofore established from the 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop, which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitations in the act, shall be available to the State committee and used to provide additional apportionments to farms.

The bill agreed upon in conference embraces portions of both the Senate and House bills to permit the surrender and reapportionment of any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm allotment which will not be planted for reallocation within the county. If any acreage remains of such released acreage it shall be transferred to the State committee for reallocation within the State. However, such surrendered acreage would be contained in the history of the farm from which it was transferred rather than the farm to which it was transferred. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned, and planted will be credited to the State and to the county in which the planting occurred.

The Senate conferees agreed to eliminate language in the Senate amendment that would have permitted acreages devoted primarily

to orchards or vineyards to be used for the first time in determining "cropland."

The conferees agreed to an amendment to the Senate bill to provide that unused acreage allotments heretofore established for extra-long-staple cotton could be released and reapportioned in the same manner as provided for upland cotton.

Senate conferees accepted the long-range features of the House bill that provide that the State acreage reserve shall be used, in addition to the uses to which such reserve may be put under existing law, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships. Provision also is made to permit the use of county reserve in adjusting farm allotments to correct inequities and prevent hardships.

SECTION 4—DURUM WHEAT

Section 4 of the bill approved by the conference committee would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas to classes of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time there is an acute shortage of Durum wheat, while production is being unduly restricted by acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

SECTION 5—POTATOES

Section 5 of the bill permits section 32 funds to be used in operations with respect to Irish potatoes. Price supports for potatoes are prohibited by section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price supports for potatoes." Section 32 operations do not provide direct price supports but, by encouraging exports and consumption, they do have the effect of supporting prices. The bill agreed upon by the conferees would not remove the general prohibition against price supports for potatoes nor reactivate the maximum potato price support provision of title 2 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 but would simply permit section 32 operations for potatoes on the same basis as for other perishable commodities.

Sections of the bill relating to classes of wheat in short supply and to Irish potatoes were not included in the House bill but were agreed upon by House conferees with minor amendments in the original language of the Senate bill relating to wheat.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
JNO. L. McMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

well as these civilian leaders, the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, have such unanimity of opinion and why the members of the Armed Services Committee, which has devoted much study and interest in this problem, should be challenged as they have been challenged here today. The question of unification is hardly pertinent to the question we have before us. I do not know how the gentleman from North Carolina voted when we established a separate Air Force. I rather imagine he voted to separate the Army from the Air Force.

Mr. BONNER. Is the gentleman speaking of me or the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM]?

Mr. SHORT. I had particularly in mind the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman that I have the greatest respect for his committee. The words that I used, the talks that I made were not facetious in any way. I do not think the thought of Congress has been carried out at all in the Unification Act. As I say, I have respect for the men in the armed services. I have never known a man, in all my experience as chairman of a committee, that I had any question about. So it is not a question of that. It is a question of who is going to train the other two branches of the service if this Air Force Academy is so necessary. Who is going to train them in air functions? I am not setting myself up as an expert. I am merely expressing my views. In the beginning I paid my respects to the ability of your committee.

Mr. SHORT. I regret that the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina were not facetious. What disturbs me is that he is serious. I can only repeat that merger can end only in mediocracy. There is a vast difference between "merger" and "unification." I think there is much benefit in a healthy, wholesome rivalry and competition among our armed services, just as there is in business. I do not think you can have esprit de corps, loyalty to a certain particular branch of the service, if you are going to put the ground force, the Air Force, the naval and marine forces all in the same kettle and stew them up. You cannot have the integrity or the identity of any force. One of the reasons that the Marines have built up such an enviable record is because they are proud to be marines. I can see no harm in the Navy and the Army competing with one another, whether it is in football or somewhere else. The only place you will find these little petty jealousies and bickerings are over in the Pentagon and, thank God, we do not have as many of these jealousies and bickerings today as we had in years gone by.

Those of you who have been out in the field, during World War II, whether it was in the Pacific, in the Mediterranean, or in Europe, and those who have visited Korea and have seen what is going on firsthand, know that we have had unification and have had it in a magnificent way in all those theaters of

war. We have had the different branches of the armed services working in the closest cooperation and in a spirit of the greatest harmony in order to bring about victory. So I hope we will not becloud the issue here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. For the purpose of accelerating the establishment of the course of instruction and activation of the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Academy, with the consent of the individuals and departments concerned, cadets and midshipmen from the upper classes of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 25, strike out all of section 6 and insert a new section 6 as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 302 (b) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 329; 10 U. S. C. 1832 (b)) is amended by inserting after the words 'provided by law,' the words 'the professors and cadets of the Air Force Academy,'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended when so specified in the appropriation act concerned, not to exceed \$10 million for the purpose of section 3 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 14, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000."

Page 5, line 15, strike out "section 3."

Page 5, line 15, after "act," insert "Of this amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 39, noes 18.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike out "section 3."

Page 5, line 15, after the word "act," insert "Of this amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, following the word "purpose", strike the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under con-

sideration the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 406, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I shall demand a rollcall vote on the passage of the bill. We have an understanding or gentleman's agreement with the gentlemen from Virginia that there would be no rollcall vote today.

The SPEAKER. That is the understanding of the leadership on the part of the House. Without objection, further proceedings will be put over until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, under the 1-minute rule, I advised my colleagues of a newly organized lobby group in the field of international trade relations. The details are as follows:

The Committee for a National Trade Policy is actively engaged in campaigning for a further reduction in tariffs.

John S. Coleman, who is chairman of the committee, testified before the Randall commission urging further trade concessions to foreign countries. Other officials of the commission also have been active on behalf of tariff reductions and published reports say that the committee plans an extensive propaganda and informational campaign in support of free trade for the future.

Obviously, this group is attempting to influence legislation on this question, which will come before the Congress during this session. This is their privilege and prerogative, but there is something about the committee which puzzles me. That is its failure to register under the Lobbying Act. If the information given me by the offices of the Clerk of the House and of the Senate is correct, the Coleman group ignored both the spirit and letter of the law in this regard.

I think the committee should explain why it has failed to register, and, while I do not want to press the point, I am wondering if it has not already violated the law. The proper authorities should investigate.

To those who may think that I am captious about this matter I would point out that there is distressing and growing unemployment in the coal fields of my district. A large part of this unemployment and economic suffering is

caused by the dumping on the east coast of residual fuel oil from Venezuela and the Middle East. This oil is displacing coal, and all efforts of the coal industry to get relief have failed thus far.

This matter is a sore subject with me, and so is the altruistic and patriotic attitude taken by many of the free traders, who profess to be primarily interested in the general welfare.

If we look closely at the matter, we are likely to find that the free traders have a pocketbook motive and that they are serving their own immediate interests.

For example, I wonder whether Mr. Coleman, who is president of the Burroughs Corp., makers of adding machines and other office equipment, is influenced by the fact that around 30 percent of the annual consolidated sales of the Burroughs Corp. and its subsidiaries are being derived from exports. This was shown in the May 25 *Dun & Bradstreet* report of the Burroughs Corp. The corporation has manufacturing subsidiaries in Canada, Great Britain, France, and Brazil.

With a very substantial portion of its income coming from foreign sales, it is obvious that the Burroughs Corp. has a double-barreled interest in reducing tariffs in the United States: First, to enable foreign countries to get more dollars to buy either completed equipment or parts in the United States; and second, to enable the foreign subsidiaries to get dollars to pay dividends and buy other American products.

Mr. Henry Ford II, has been very active on behalf of the Coleman committee and of the free-trade movement generally. The Ford Motor Co. has stock control of 26 assembly or manufacturing plants outside the United States and 100-percent ownership of those in Mexico, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil. However, the primary interest of the Ford Co. so far as foreign trade is concerned is the sale of more American cars abroad and in maintaining these plants a large volume of motorcar exports. The big automobile makers and some other mass production industries have advantages in techniques which enable them to sell abroad in competition with foreign-car makers. But this advantage does not extend to many American industries whose high-wage levels put them at a disadvantage in meeting foreign competition.

Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, is president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy. He has spoken out strongly in favor of freer trade and against proposals by the coal industry to curtail the importation of residual oil.

Mr. Taft has been registered as a foreign agent on behalf of the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce. One of the things for which he was paid was to defeat legislation, or other action, which would interfere with the flow of Venezuelan oil to this country in direct competition with the production of our bituminous coal mines.

Another officer of the Coleman committee is Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of General Mills, Inc., makers of flour and other grain products.

I am surprised at Mr. Bullis' presence on the committee. He should join with those who are trying to get relief from unfair foreign competition. Mr. Bullis' company has full protection against foreign competition, in the form of quotas which keep out almost all foreign wheat and flour. Furthermore, under the International Wheat Agreement, the makers of flour get what amounts to a subsidy and in the year which ended August 1, 1952, this country exported around 35 million bushels of wheat in the form of flour. Mr. Bullis' industry, thus has complete protection against foreign competition and an export subsidy. His presence on the Coleman committee then is inconsistent to say the least.

It is high time that this whole matter is brought into the open and the motives of those who are seeking further tariff cuts are analyzed and stripped of their pretenses. Most of the free traders are working in their own selfish interests. This should be clearly understood. It will help in considering this whole question of foreign trade.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

(Mr. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that one of our colleagues will be featured tonight on a national network TV show, *This Is Your Life*. He is the Honorable DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW, of Utah.

DOUG left last night for Los Angeles ostensibly to address a JC convention. Actually he will be brought into the program tonight at 10 o'clock not knowing that his life is to be featured on the show.

I hope that those of you who are able will take advantage of the opportunity to see the TV show and see the life of our distinguished colleague portrayed on that program.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1109)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as

follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) The national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton shall be increased to twenty-one million acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A) three hundred and fifteen thousand additional acres shall be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half being made to the States participating therein on the basis of their respective shares of the increased national acreage allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as may be required to provide each State a total allotment under subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The additional acreage made available to States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this paragraph (1) shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, and the additional acreage shall be apportioned to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That, if the county committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional county allotment among farms in the county, the additional acreage shall be apportioned by the county committee to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the county; if the additional acreage available to the county is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed the acreage remaining after making such increases shall be allotted to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) (3). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, if the State committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph (1) it shall apportion such additional allotment directly to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted

to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the State total of the farm increases so computed exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. Before apportioning such unallotted acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallotted acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section. Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"(2) Any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment transferred under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned

under this paragraph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county in determining future acreage allotments. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply also to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than one hundred thousand acres but more than thirty thousand acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 per centum of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton."

"Sec. 2. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In any county in which a major flood control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest.'

"Sec. 3. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended, effective beginning with the 1955 crop, as follows:

"(a) By striking the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding 'or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.'

"(b) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon before the word '*Provided*' and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding 'or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship:'.

"(c) By adding a new paragraph '(6)' at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such three year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3)."

"Sec. 4. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any class or sub-class of wheat that a substantial differ-

ence exists in the usage or marketing outlets therefor and that the supply of such wheat for the 1953-54 and 1954-55 marketing years with respect to the 1954 crop, and for the 1954-55 and 1955-56 marketing years with respect to the 1955 crop, will be substantially short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements for such wheat for such marketing years, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such crop of wheat for farms which produced such wheat in one or more of the preceding three years to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage seeded to such class or sub-class of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, and shall not be used to increase the acreage allotment applicable to other wheat produced on farms for which such additional acreage has been allotted, nor shall such acreage be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes' (7 U. S. C. 1450), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'Operations with respect to Irish potatoes authorized by section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446).'

"(b) The parenthetical phrase contained in the sentence preceding the last sentence of section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes' (7 U. S. C. 612c), is amended to read as follows: '(other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949).'

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
J. L. McMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
KARL E. MUNDT,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPFEL,
HERMAN WELKER,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing positions of the two Houses on H. R. 6665, as originally passed by the House and as amended by the Senate, relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The conference substitute relates to cotton, durum wheat, and Irish potatoes.

It should be pointed out to the House, prior to a discussion of the agreement reached by its conferees, that the House on July 31, 1953 passed H. R. 6665, intended to deal not only with the special problems in 1954, but also to perfect and facilitate the operation of the cotton acreage allotment and marketing quota program in subsequent years. The House action occurred prior to the allocation of the 1954 national cotton acreage allotment and the referendum of December 15, 1953, under present law. The legislation was sent to the Senate, where

action was taken January 12, 1954 in the manner of a substitute for the House bill, dealing only with the emergency acreage allotment problems for the 1954 cotton crop, and with Irish potatoes and special class of wheat. Meanwhile, in the interim of the action between the two Houses, a cotton crop had been harvested which exceeded by approximately 2 million bales the estimate on the 1953 crop that was available to the House when it acted upon H. R. 6665.

The legislation agreed upon by the committee of conference, presented in this report, adopts, subject to certain modifications, the Senate bill's emergency provisions for the 1954 crop and accepts, with some revisions, the House bill's provisions of a permanent nature relating to acreage allotments and quotas for the long range cotton program.

The primary purpose of the legislation, agreed upon in conference, is to provide for adjustments to facilitate a reduction in the production of cotton for 1954 without causing unnecessary hardships, and to revise the basic legislation in a manner to facilitate necessary adjustments in the future.

Except for clarifying minor changes, the substitute bill agreed upon by the conferees is explained below.

SECTION 1. COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The first paragraph of this section embraces the Senate provision increasing the national acreage allotment for the 1954 cotton crop to 21,000,000 acres and apportioning this acreage to the States in the same

manner in which the 17,910,448 national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, the legislation agreed upon provides 315,000 additional acres of allotment to be apportioned, one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other cotton producing States, these two prorrations to be made to the States sharing therein, other than those receiving the minimum allotments under subsection 344 (k), on the basis of their respective shares of the 21 million acre national acreage allotment. Furthermore, the legislation provides that no cotton-producing State shall receive a total allotment of less than 66 percent of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The Senate conferees accepted an amendment proposed by the House conferees that such acreage, under the 66 percent guarantee to each state, would to the extent planted not go into the state history of cotton plantings for purposes of computing future state cotton acreage allotments. The effect of this paragraph is to set a total national cotton acreage allotment of 21,379,342 acres for 1954. H. R. 6665 as passed by the House would have set a national allotment at 22,672,700 acres.

Set out below is a table showing the manner in which the additional acreage allotments provided by the bill agreed upon by the conferees would be apportioned among the states:

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage ¹	1953 acreage in cultivation, July 1	1954 State acreage allotments, 17,910,448	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres ²	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average ³		State acreage added by reason of 66-percent provision ⁴	State acreage added by reason of 15-percent provision	Proposed State acreage allotments
					157,500	157,500			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,690	10,711				1,346,401
Arizona	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958		39,362	36,495		413,815
Arkansas	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,693				1,847,036
California	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220		95,298	22,879		936,297
Florida	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,837		311		4,968	44,116
Georgia	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458				1,188,894
Illinois	2,750	2,400	4,000	4,000					4,000
Kansas	35		40	40					40
Kentucky	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713		86			10,799
Louisiana	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466		5,970			750,436
Mississippi	2,435,090	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,063,288		16,545			2,079,833
Missouri	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681				462,617
Nevada	1,950	2,000	2,289	2,289					2,289
New Mexico	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102		22,840			218,942
North Carolina	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,860		4,971			624,831
Oklahoma	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547		8,736			1,098,283
South Carolina	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,640		7,390			929,030
Tennessee	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268		5,415			680,683
Texas	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361				8,719,178
Virginia	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172				21,682
United States	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

¹ Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.

² Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in column (3).

³ 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of

their 5-year base one to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.

⁴ Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.

⁵ Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Two alternative formulas are provided for apportioning the acreage made available to States under the provisions of paragraph (1), as follows:

(a) After the additional acreage is apportioned to the States, if the State committee determines that such action will result in more adequately correcting individual farm allotment hardship cases for 1954, this additional acreage may be distributed directly to farms so as to provide—to the extent the acreage will permit—each eligible farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of these 3 years, but with a provision that each State may decide upon a cropland percentage lim-

itation as to the total acres that may be allotted under this provision to an individual farm.

(b) The additional State allotment may go directly to counties on the basis of their respective allotment shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned, and the county committee may decide to use either, (1) the county cropland factor procedure, or (2) the 65-40 procedure described above.

In the Senate amendment, the additional acres allotted to a farm could not bring the total farm allotment to more than 50 percent of the total cropland on the farm. Because of differences in farming practices in different States, the committee of conference decided to leave the final determination of this figure to the State committees, but

not to exceed 50 percent of the cropland. The language in the conference substitute will permit each State committee, taking into consideration certain factors, to determine the figure for that State. This will for example permit the Western States—California, Arizona, and New Mexico—if their State committees so determine, to fix the maximum at 50 percent, while the Eastern States, some of which prefer a 40 percent maximum, can adopt that figure or any other less than 50 percent which the State committee may determine.

If the additional acreage allotted a State is not sufficient to provide the proposed increases in farm allotments in full, by use of formula (a), all the proposed farm increases would be reduced proportionately. If the additional acreage allotted the State

is more than sufficient, the excess would first be used to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in section 344 (f) (1) of the Act, as amended.

The conference committee accepted a proposal that any part of the county allotment heretofore established from the 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop, which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitations in the Act, shall be available to the State committee and used to provide additional apportionments to farms.

The bill agreed upon in conference embraces portions of both the Senate and House bills to permit the surrender and reapportionment of any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm allotment which will not be planted for reallocation within the county. If any acreage remains of such released acreage it shall be transferred to the State committee for reallocation within the State. However, such surrendered acreage would be contained in the history of the farm from which it was transferred rather than the farm to which it was transferred. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned, and planted will be credited to the State and to the county in which the planting occurred.

The Senate conferees agreed to eliminate language in the Senate amendment that would have permitted acreages devoted primarily to orchards or vineyards to be used for the first time in determining "cropland."

The conferees agreed to an amendment to the Senate bill to provide that unused acreage allotments heretofore established for extra long staple cotton could be released and reapportioned in the same manner as provided for upland cotton.

Senate conferees accepted the long range features of the House bill that provide that the State acreage reserve shall be used, in addition to the uses to which such reserve may be put under existing law, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships. Provision also is made to permit the use of county reserve in adjusting farm allotments to correct inequities and prevent hardships.

SECTION 4. DURUM WHEAT

Section 4 of the bill approved by the Conference Committee would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas to classes of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time, there is an acute shortage of durum wheat, while production is being unduly restricted by acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

SECTION 5. POTATOES

Section 5 of the bill permits section 32 funds to be used in operations with respect to Irish potatoes. Price supports for potatoes are prohibited by section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, and to price supports for potatoes." Section 32 operations do not provide direct price supports but, by encouraging exports and consumption, they do have the effect of supporting prices. The bill agreed upon by the conferees would not remove the general prohibition against price supports for potatoes nor reactivate the maximum potato price support provision of title 2 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 but would simply permit section 32 operations for potatoes on the same basis as for other perishable commodities.

Sections of the bill relating to classes of wheat in short supply and to Irish potatoes were not included in the House bill but were agreed upon by House conferees with minor

amendments in the original language of the Senate bill relating to wheat.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
J. L. MCMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 727. An act to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINSHAW, for January 21, 1954, on account of official business.

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. WAMPLER), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON), for today, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include a statement on all matters incidental to the launching of the *Nautilus*, the first atomic-powered submarine, which will be launched tomorrow at Groton, Conn.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. LAIRD and to include an editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include an editorial.

Mr. MASON and to include an article.

Mr. OAKMAN and to include 3 articles and a speech by Henry Ford at Philadelphia on Saturday, January 16, 1954, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$191.25.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address by Mr. Thomas B. Russell, president of the Alabama Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. ENGLE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN in four instances and to include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. CELLER in three instances.

Mr. SECREST and to include an article.
Mr. MADDEN and to include a letter from E. W. Jackson, of the Lake County Jewelers Association.

Mr. DELANEY and to include an address by Hon. James A. Farley before the St. Paul Guild in New York City on January 11, 1954.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial.
Mr. RAYBURN.

Mr. REES of Kansas in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include two editorials.

Mr. HUNTER and to include two editorials.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois) and to include an article.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER and to include a letter to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MOSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and Mr. FALLON.

Mr. McCORMACK in two instances, in one to include a sermon recently delivered by Archbishop O'Boyle, of Washington, and in the other a memorandum from the Library of Congress.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

Mr. WOLVERTON in nine instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES and to include a speech.

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. SHAFFER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) in two instances.

Mr. SHUFORD and to include a statement.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1170. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report by rank and age group the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army and Air Force or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1171. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the third report covering the operations of the Selective Service System up to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, trans-

mitting a report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture regarding the disposal of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1173. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1174. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels in the Coast Guard service, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1176. A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting the annual report for 1953 on all tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 983; 28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Sam B. Davis, Jr., which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 4, National Park Service, authorize him to conduct pack and saddle horse operations in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1187. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7209. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTÉ: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 405. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and \$350 funeral expenses to Daisy M. Maupin, mother of Sarah A. Mitchell, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3477. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; with

amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6665. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas (Rept. No. 1109). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7369. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act to permit the States to organize military forces, other than as parts of their National Guard units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7370. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong.), so as to require the consent of the Indian tribes to the assumption of jurisdiction by States over civil and criminal actions arising in Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7371. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7372. A bill to provide cost-of-living pay adjustments for officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and for postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7373. A bill to preserve the right to removal procedures in the case of certain officers and employees in positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 7374. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switch-blade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7375. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$750 the income-tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer for himself and for his spouse or other first dependent, and to increase the amount of credit for a dependent from \$600 to \$750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7376. A bill to reduce the tax burden by establishing three new surtax brackets on net income below \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7377. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7378. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct housing loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7379. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm-realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 7380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the estab-

lishment of a radio-propagation laboratory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7381. A bill to provide that failure of any officer or employee of the United States to answer certain questions shall result in removal from his position or office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend to fruit and vegetable storage facilities the same amortization deduction now provided for grain storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7383. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 7385. A bill to extend to ROTC students called or ordered to active training duty certain benefits which have been extended to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and members of the National Guard, who are called or ordered to active training duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7386. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that \$150 per month of retirement income shall be nontaxable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for his own education or for the education of any other person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 7388. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7389. A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 7390. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7391. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7392. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct housing loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7393. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir, on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7394. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7395. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Com-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

January 22, 1954
January 21, 1954
83rd, 2nd, No. 11

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7	Fisheries.....11	Purchasing.....17
A. A. A.....10	Labor, farm.....12	Reports.....3
Annual leave.....8	Missouri Basin.....13	Retirement.....3, 6
Committee assignments.....4	Personnel.....3, 6, 3	R. E. A.....3
Cotton.....2, 15	Potatoes.....2	Section 32.....2
Education.....9	President's Budget.....1	Trade, foreign.....17
Farm program.....14	Prices, farm.....5	Wheat.....2, 15
Farm surplus.....16		

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on cotton-allotments, potato, wheat bill. House received President's budget message.

HOUSE

1. PRESIDENT'S BUDGET. Received the President's Budget message (H. Doc. 264) (pp. 545-76).
2. COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6665, establishing cotton acreage allotments for 1954, authorizing purchase of Irish potatoes with section 32 funds, and permitting the Secretary to allot additional acreage for special wheat types in short supply (pp. 578-83).
3. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (p. 593):
Operations of the REA
On retirement provisions for Federal personnel, pursuant to Public Law 555, 82nd Cong.
4. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Rep. Poff resigned from the Government Operations Committee and Rep. Lipscomb was elected a member of this committee (p. 583).
5. FARM PRICES. Rep. Vursell discussed the Administration's accomplishments and said, "Statistics show that farm prices which have been going down steadily since 1947 have been checked within the past 2 months and are steadily rising week by week" (pp. 585-6).
6. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee announced that public hearings have been scheduled on salary and employee benefit legislation beginning Feb. 8 (p. D46).
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Jan. 25 (p. 593).

BILLS INTRODUCED

8. PERSONNEL. F. R. 7430, by Rep. Barrett, to increase the basic rates of compen-

sation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 593).

H. R. 7442, by Rep. Lesinski, to provide for lump-sum payment of excess annual leave of Government officers and employees to the credit of their civil service retirement accounts; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 593).

9. EDUCATION. H. R. 7434, by Rep. Frelinghuysen, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 593).

H. R. 7446, by Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., to authorize cooperative research in education; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 593).

10. AAA. H. R. 7447, by Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., to amend section 8c (6) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to Agriculture Committee (p. 593).

11. FISHERIES. H. R. 7441, by Rep. Knox, to further encourage the distribution of fishery products; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee (p. 593).

12. FARM LABOR. H. J. Res. 357, by Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; to Agriculture Committee (p. 593).

13. MISSOURI BASIN. H. R. 7439, by Rep. Hope, to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colo., Iowa, Kans., Minn., Mo., Mont., Nebr., N. Dak., S. Dak., and Wyo., to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 593).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Hope inserted his speech before the Future Farmers of America and one before the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce explaining the present farm situation and the need for future leadership and for the businessman's understanding in this area (pp. A431-3, A461-4).

15. COTTON; WHEAT. Speech by Rep. Teague opposing H. R. 6665, to increase the cotton-acreage allotment for 1954, claiming it to be sectional legislation "for the benefit of one section at the expense of the other" (pp. A449-50).

Extension of remarks by Rep. Heselton opposing H. R. 6665, claiming that this type of legislation may bring on a demand for the elimination of the present program and "will return to haunt those who supported it", and inserting quotations from the Secretary and the President to support him (pp. A464-5).

16. FARM SURPLUS. Rep. King inserted an editorial on the need to find outlets for the present farm surplus by extending the President's authority to distribute the surplus to friendly countries (pp. A439-40).

17. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Kean inserted the recommendations of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, including one to reduce discrimination against foreign goods by Government procurement agencies (p. A442).

Rep. Patterson inserted a letter written to an editor discussing the "threat to employment of American workers by indiscriminate lowering of our tariffs" (pp. A443-4).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS: Forest grazing policies, S. Agriculture, JAN. 22. Eden SCS project, H. Interior, JAN. 27, (Young to testify).

Kee	Nelson	Short
Kelley, Pa.	Nicholson	Sieminski
Kelly, N. Y.	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Keogh	Norrell	Simpson, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.	Oakman	Small
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Kirwan	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Klein	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Knox	O'Hara, Ill.	Spence
Krueger	O'Hara, Minn.	Staggers
Landrum	O'Neill	Stauffer
Lane	Osmers	Steed
Lanham	Ostertag	Sullivan
Latham	Passman	Sutton
LeCompte	Patman	Talle
Lesinski	Pelly	Teague
Lipscomb	Perkins	Thompson, La.
Long	Pfost	Thompson, Tex.
Lucas	Phillips	Thornberry
Lyle	Poage	Tollefson
McCarthy	Poff	Trimble
McConnell	Polk	Utt
McCormack	Preston	Van Zandt
McDonough	Price	Velde
McIntire	Priest	Vinson
McMillan	Rains	Vorys
McVey	Ray	Vursell
Machrowicz	Rayburn	Walter
Mack, Wash.	Reed, Ill.	Warburton
Madden	Rees, Kans.	Watts
Magnuson	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
Mahon	Riehlman	Wharton
Mailliard	Riley	Wheeler
Martin, Iowa	Rivers	Whitten
Mason	Roberts	Wickersham
Matthews	Robeson, Va.	Widnall
Meador	Robson, Ky.	Williams, Miss.
Merrill	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, N. J.
Merrow	Rogers, Fla.	Williams, N. Y.
Metcalf	Rogers, Mass.	Willis
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Calif.
Mills	Rooney	Wilson, Ind.
Mollohan	Roosevelt	Wilson, Tex.
Morano	St. George	Winstead
Morgan	Schenck	Withrow
Morrison	Scott	Wolcott
Moss	Scudder	Wolverton
Moulder	Secrest	Young
Multer	Selden	Younger
Mumma	Shafer	Zablocki
Natcher	Shelley	
Neal	Sheppard	

NAYS—36

Andersen,	Harrison, Nebr.	Reams
H. Carl	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton,	Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Oliver P.	King, Pa.	Scrivner
Budge	Laird	Shuford
Byrnes, Wis.	Lantaff	Sikes
Cannon	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Marshall	Taber
Clardy	Miller, Kans.	Thompson,
Cotton	Miller, Nebr.	Mich.
Davis, Wis.	Pilcher	Van Pelt
D'Ewart	Prouty	Wainwright
Gross	Rabaut	Wier

NOT VOTING—69

Addonizio	Donohue	Philbin
Alexander	Durham	Pillion
Andrews	Gamble	Powell
Bentsen	Golden	Radwan
Boland	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Brownson	Holifield	Regan
Buchanan	Horan	Richards
Buckley	Hruska	Rodino
Busbey	Jackson	Sadlak
Carrigg	Jarman	Saylor
Chelf	Jonas, N. C.	Scherer
Chudoff	Kilburn	Seely-Brown
Cole, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Sheehan
Coudert	Kluczynski	Springer
Cretella	Lovre	Stringfellow
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McGregor	Thomas
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, Md.	Tuck
Dawson, Utah	Miller, N. Y.	Wampler
Deane	Murray	Welchel
Dingell	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Dodd	Patten	Yates
Dondero	Patterson	Yorty

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Jonas of North Carolina with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Deane.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Bentsen.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Addonizio.
Mr. Golden with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Wampler with Mr. Yorty.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Dondero with Mrs. Buchanan.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Scherer with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Miller of Maryland with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Carrigg with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Hruska with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Brownson with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Saylor with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Lovre with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority in favor of the passage of H. R. 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy clearly reveals the conclusion of Congress that the defense and security of our country makes it necessary that our chief line of defense is and will be our Air Forces. The bill we have passed necessarily omitted a specific location for the Air Force Academy for several reasons; however, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not mention that the Sedalia Air Force Base in Missouri offers not only ideal and strategic location with every possible desirable factor and geographic location, but also will provide a savings of millions of dollars in cost of construction.

More than \$40 million is now invested in the Sedalia Air Force Base, offering many of the facilities that will be required in connection with the operation of an Air Force Academy. The Air Force Academy or school should not be located in any extreme west, east, north, or south part of the United States. It should, for many good reasons, be located and established in a central location to achieve convenient access to and from all other parts of the country, and the Sedalia Air Force Base location provides that as well as all other facilities and requirements for the location, establishment, and operation of the Air Force Academy.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

(Mr. CHATHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was very much embarrassed this morning, and I am sure will hear some more about it in the future, because my remarks on yesterday afternoon in opposition to the Air Force Academy were not included

in this morning's RECORD. I waited until nearly everyone left yesterday afternoon and for 2 hours in my office for the copy to come over. I immediately went through it, corrected it, and put it in the pickup station where I was told to leave it. This morning it was back in my office, and where I was supposed to have my remarks, following the address by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], the following appears:

[Mr. CHATHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Immediately following are the remarks of my distinguished friend from Louisiana replying to my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the statement I have now made and my remarks of yesterday in opposition to the bill may be included.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why does not the gentleman put them in ahead of the other, if that is what he wants? He can do that if he wants to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman modify his request accordingly?

Mr. CHATHAM. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The remarks referred to by Mr. CHATHAM are as follows:)

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. CHATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not know when I prepared my notes that the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the distinguished gentleman from California were going to buck the trend today, which has veered and yawed a little bit from the question until sometimes it looked like a chamber of commerce brief for either the fogbound coast of California or the tornado-ridden areas of Texas or the pleasant, sunny climate of the Carolinas. I was particularly impressed by what the gentleman from California had to say. I am sure every man in this Chamber wants the best Air Force possible. Certainly I question whether the way proposed is the best way to get it. I have been through both ends of the service in the Navy—at sea and in the high departments in Washington. I think we are all for more unification and not for less unification, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] just said. Everyone who knows anything about the service knows today that the rivalry between the services is at fever heat, with one exception, the Navy and the Marines. If the people of this country were asked to vote today on the one elite service in our country, I think there is no doubt but that the answer would be the Marines. The Marine and Navy officers are educated, trained, and worked together. The Marines in World War II were fighting with the Army, completely aside from the Navy; also in the Korean war. The command for

which the corps was fashioned was to be the amphibious group of the Navy. Amphibious warfare was engaged in by the United States Marines long before the landings in the Pacific and at Normandy. They were experts in amphibious warfare two or three generations ago. I sincerely believe, in the light of what has happened, that if the Air Force and the Army were remerged, the effectiveness and the morale of both services would be improved, unless complete unification of all three Academies could be effected.

I do not know how many people are familiar with the Board that was appointed by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard under the late Secretary Forrestal. Dr. Compton, the head of MIT, was Chairman of that Board, and they were to make a survey of the service Academies, West Point and Annapolis, and give Secretary Bard the results of their findings. This Board brought in a report which was of extreme interest to all people in civil life who had come into the war effort, but not of such supreme interest to the men who had graduated from Annapolis and West Point.

May I step aside for a moment to say to my good friend, a man whom I greatly admire, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, when he spoke of engineers and dentists, the greatest force that has come to my part of the South, and certainly I think it is a distinguished State that has moved forward faster than any other State in the Union, was when we consolidated three great institutions of learning, which were entirely separate, into what is known as the Greater University of North Carolina. State College in North Carolina and Clemson in South Carolina, and VPI in Virginia, are doing the best work in our contiguous States. They are giving the basic training to young men who live together in dormitories, who are taking agriculture at State and engineering at State and textiles at State, three completely different branches of education, just like the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, growing up together. The effect has been that when these men go out into business, in textiles, in agriculture, or engineering, for the rest of their lives they work together for the good of the State and for the good of their different branches. I think that friendships would be formed on the basis of the Compton report and cooperation started in their early education that would affect their service. The Compton report says that young men from all colleges and universities of the country should be allowed to choose admission to one of the great service Academies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(Mr. CHATHAM asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHATHAM. The Compton report said that men who spent 2 years in their college or university and who passed the requirements for the one service academy be allowed to go to that academy for 3 more years of training; really a post-graduate school. You would have

branches of air and these basic things that have been mentioned, aerodynamics, electronics, weather, and all these things; you would also have individual branches for Army and Navy, which also includes basic education. At the graduation of those men from those academies they would get 2 diplomas, 1 from the service academy and 1 from the college from which they came to the service academy, giving them something that would be not only a matter of great pride, but showing that they had passed their 3 years of cooperation and coordination which, in one generation, would mean that men in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force would have a different sense of rivalry that they have today, where the rivalry has been, as I said, at fever heat. Certainly I think that was one of the soundest recommendations of that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that not exactly what they do in the War College? They have people from all branches of the service. They rub elbows even with people in the State Department, and that brings about harmony and understanding.

Mr. CHATHAM. I think that is an argument in favor of what I am saying, because the War College is composed of a small group of the very finest of men who are picked for the top leadership of the services. But I personally think that they should be brought in in their younger days, live together and train together to get the cooperation that they should have.

As to the matter of location, if this bill is passed, I think the planners, the people who pick the site, should do so in the view that some day this unification of service academies will come. It should be on blue water, in the right climate, with plenty of room for airfields and facilities and with the necessary highway and rail transportation.

I do not think any of the services will cotton to this suggestion or to the remarks that were made by the two gentlemen preceding me. I do not think they will be gleeful over what I have been saying, but I think, for the best interests of this country, and to save money, it is a sound proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is general understanding that some people in the gallery have had a copy of the President's budget and tax message since yesterday, the Members would like to know where they can obtain a copy of the message or whether they should wait until tomorrow when it is printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that there are copies available

in the document room for each Member.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, we should go to the document room and obtain copies?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of January 20, 1954.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that in the closing days of the last session the House passed a bill relating to acreage allotments for cotton. The Senate did not take up that bill before adjournment.

The Senate has now passed the bill after substituting its own provisions for those contained in the House bill. This is a conference report reconciling the differences between the two bills.

The bill which passed the House provided that the national cotton acreage allotment for 1954 should be 22,613,000 acres, and there were provisions for dividing that acreage among the States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. What would the acreage for cotton have been but for the enactment of this legislation?

Mr. HOPE. The allotment which was made by the Secretary of Agriculture under presently existing law was 17,910,448 acres. That was the maximum amount the Secretary could make. It was recognized by everyone that that was not an adequate acreage, that it would result in great distress among cotton producers, and that it might produce less than an adequate supply of cotton in the event we had a poor crop year.

The bill, as it passed the other body, provided for a total of 21,379,342 acres, and contained provisions for dividing that between the States in the eastern and western areas in the Cotton Belt, under what, I think, is as satisfactory an arrangement as can be worked out. The Senate bill also set up a method for allocating the extra acres. It must be understood that the 17,910,448 acres has already been allocated. No change can be made in that. But the extra acreage will be allocated under a formula set up in the bill as agreed on in conference. In the interest of time I will not elabo-

rate further on the specific provisions of the bill but will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The conference report then provides the overall acreage provisions as provided in the Senate bill; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct. The acreage is the same as in the Senate bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us in his presentation of this matter how this disposition of it ties in with the recommendations made by the President for an agricultural price policy?

Mr. HOPE. There is no connection between this bill and the President's recommendations for long-range farm legislation. But I am glad to advise the gentleman that this bill and the acreage carried in it is based upon a recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture requested the Congress to enact legislation to provide this number of acres for the national cotton acreage allotment this year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. It might be well if the gentleman would also point out the fact that in July the House passed a bill fixing the minimum acreage at 22,500,000 so the bill now before us is for at least a million acres lower than the bill which we passed in July.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct. Of course, in July the estimate for cotton production for 1953 was more than 2 million bales below what the final production turned out to be.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman might also point out and I would also like to point out to the House at this time that this bill now provides a minimum which is about 4 million acres less than was planted in cotton in this country last year.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman advise the Members how much cotton there is now in storage being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think I have the figure in mind at the present moment, but I will be glad to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not approximately 1 year's supply?

Mr. HOPE. I think the total cotton supply including what is in the hands of the Government and what is outside, above the amount that will be consumed in this current year, amounts to about a year's domestic requirements.

Mr. HESELTON. Can the gentleman inform the House how much additional cotton there will be in terms of the additional acreage that is provided in this conference report?

Mr. HOPE. That depends, of course, so largely upon weather and insect pests

and plant diseases that I would not want to venture a prediction. But, it is 4 million acres less than the acreage which was planted last year. Of course, we had an extraordinarily heavy yield last year, one of the greatest yields per acre, I believe, that we have ever had.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it safe to say that if we pass this conference report this afternoon, there will have to be bought a great many thousands of bales of cotton by the Government which will have to be placed in storage during the next year?

Mr. HOPE. No, I would not be prepared to make that statement.

Undoubtedly there will be cotton put under loan, some of which will get into the hands of the Government. But so far in the cotton program the Government has not sustained any loss, and I do not believe it will under this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say at the outset that I favor this conference report, and I shall vote for its adoption. I would call to the attention of the gentleman, as he has said, that last summer when this matter was before us I worked as best I could as majority leader to bring the measure to passage. Prior to that time, when a similar situation confronted us with respect to wheat, I aided in bringing the matter to passage. I have asked the gentleman to yield only for this purpose: We are operating under certain farm programs that have been enacted in the past with bipartisan support. Members on both sides have tried as best they could to solve the agricultural problems and to develop a sound program. To my mind, the colloquies which have taken place and the explanation of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] offer clear evidence that certain difficulties and troubles are arising under the operation of the program. It appears that with respect to both wheat and cotton we are confronted with huge carryovers. Under existing law the formula provided for requires that the acreage be cut back very, very substantially. With respect to cotton, frequently it has been said to me that if we do not increase the acreage the decrease would be so great as to bring actual distress among the cotton farmers. Of course that is the reason for this legislation. I say again, it points up a weakness, it points up a difficulty which I think the Congress must consider whenever future action is taken.

I appreciate and understand the position of the advocates of a rigid, high, inflexible support price. I supported and voted for it as I did the 1948 and the 1949 acts. But it has also come to my attention that if you have this high support price we are going to avoid serious difficulty, we are going to avoid serious drains on the Government only by the imposition of very strict quota acreage allotments.

I am going to support this conference report. What we are trying to do is to avoid the impact of the very formula we created in the law. May I say this to my colleagues, we cannot continue for-

ever to have it both ways. I think we must recognize that we cannot always reach for the sweet and then, when the bitter comes along, say we are not going to take that. We will just vote a lot more capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation. All I am saying, as I have said before, is that I think certain weaknesses and difficulties are appearing. No one advocates any abrupt, overnight change from what we have, but at the same time I think we would be reckless with our responsibility if we did not recognize the existence of some of these difficulties and weaknesses, and by a gradual process undertake as best we can to make adjustments that would seem to be indicated. As a matter of fact, I think both the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] would agree with me that this is a temporary adjustment in the farm program, indicated as necessary. But, beyond that, again may I say I do not think we can continue forever to have it both ways. In addition, as the Committee on Agriculture begins a study of this very difficult, complex problem, I trust that they will have these matters in mind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like the gentleman to inform the House whether there is anything in this conference report, or in this bill, if we adopt it, that would prevent us from following the kind of agricultural-price program the President has recommended.

Mr. HOPE. I can say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would in any way affect long-range legislation that may be brought up this year concerning agriculture. This bill has two aspects. One deals with the acreage allotments for this year and the other deals with the method of making acreage allotments in the future. In other words, there are temporary and permanent provisions of this bill. There is nothing in the bill that would interfere with any action that the Congress might take during this session with respect to revising farm legislation.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to repeat the figure of the additional number of acres that would be brought in; I understood the gentleman to say three or four million.

Mr. HOPE. The number of acres that was allotted under existing law was 17,910,448. Under this bill there would be allotted overall, in total, 21,379,342, or about 3½ million acres additional.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the bill did. There had been farmers who had been growing cotton and among them there were those who had 50 acres, 150 acres, 200 acres. They had contractual agreements with their tenants and sharecroppers. But along came this bill and a farmer, in some instances, was cut 65 percent. Of course, that just played havoc with the whole setup. It did not bother the 5-acre man, but the 50-acre man or the 150-acre man, who

were small farmers too, it put them on the road looking for another farm for them to go to.

Now, do I understand that these approximately 4 million acres are to be used in bringing up the overall average in a State, or will they be used to bring up the average in the particular counties that were cut the most?

Mr. HOPE. The additional acreage will be distributed under the formula contained in the bill. Certainly it will not take care of every hardship case and give everybody all the acreage he feels he should have. But we think it will help a great deal.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is the thing that is interesting to me. I did not have a single group of farmers approach me who did not say readily, "We are perfectly willing to cut our crop 20 percent, 30 percent, or 40 percent if need be. We are in favor of a reduction of acreage, but we cannot understand why 1 county is cut 65 percent, and another county 30 percent, while maybe the small farmer somewhere is not cut at all."

They did not like the inequity that existed there under the formula that distributed the 17 million acres.

If this additional acreage is to be used to level up allotments, I think that will appeal to the agricultural people because, in the long run, I do not know of any people on earth who have a keener sense of fair play than they do. All they want is to be treated alike.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that this is to be used for the purpose of leveling up, as the gentleman says. I certainly would not want to say that it is going to give everybody all the acreage he thinks he should have, but it will be used for the purpose of adjusting inequities and taking care of those situations the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The report refers to durum wheat. I would like to have it made clear that the Secretary has the authority to increase the acreage allotted for durum-wheat production for this year if he finds there is a shortage of this particular type of wheat, which wheat is used largely for macaroni. Is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. Under the language now contained in the conference report, that authority will extend for this year and next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart].

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially address my remarks to section 4, paragraph E, wherein the Secretary is permitted to increase the acreage allotment of classes or subclasses of wheat which are found to be in short supply over a 3-year period. I introduced a bill along those lines earlier in this session. That provision in this conference report takes care of the situation, and I appreciate the efforts along these lines made by the conference committee.

There are many classes of wheat, and they are used for various purposes.

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in applying acreage restrictions, is permitted no discretion, and the same restriction must be applied to all wheat, even though, as is now the case, there exists a very real shortage of certain important classes.

For the past several months I have been working along with Hon. J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of Montana; Hon. Albert J. Kruse, the Montana State commissioner of agriculture; and others in an effort to obtain larger acreage allotments for those Montana and Dakota farmers who produce high-protein wheat. The Secretary of Agriculture has been unable to comply with our request because the present law does not permit him to differentiate.

Montana high-protein hard-winter and spring wheat is necessary to produce the flour for yeast-leavened bakery products such as bread, rolls, and sweet goods. Generally it is not interchangeable with the soft wheats, although it is sometimes mixed with other wheat in order to produce a higher protein product.

During the past year Montana farmers received premiums as high as 50 cents per acre on this desirable and necessary wheat. This, I believe, gives good indication of the demand for our wheat, and the fact is that the hard winter and spring wheat, with its high-protein content, is not contributing to the overall surplus of wheat.

Under these circumstances, while it is necessary to curtail wheat production generally; it certainly is not necessary or in the public interest to curtail the production of high-protein wheat.

The same general considerations apply to the durum wheat, grown primarily in North Dakota, which is used for macaroni and many other products and for which there is no substitute. I note that the report on this measure refers to durum as an example of the class of wheat for which special consideration is required. As I have pointed out, durum is not alone, however, and we are hopeful that the Secretary will now proceed, as soon as this measure is approved, to make the necessary and desirable increases in the acreages for high-protein wheat so that the American people will continue to have adequate supplies of this vital product.

(Mr. D'Ewart asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Budge].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I note in section 5 of the conference report a general discussion of price supports for Irish potatoes. I also note that the language here would not normally be construed to encompass price supports for Irish potatoes. I would like to have the chairman of the Agricultural Committee advise me whether I am correct in assuming that it is not the intention of the committee to include price supports for potatoes?

Mr. HOPE. The language speaks for itself. It does provide for section 32 operations as far as Irish potatoes are concerned. In other words, Irish potatoes may be produced under the section 32

program by authority of this legislation.

Mr. BUDGE. But it is not the intention to place Irish potatoes under any support program other than by the use of section 32 funds?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. King].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is true, however, that the rider attached to this bill puts the Government back in the potato business, is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. I will say to a very limited extent.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Only 18 months ago the potato interests that were pushing this were outspoken in opposition to any form of Government participation in the potato business. It is significant, if you watch the futures market, that, since this proposal was made and they figured out how much the Government needed to put into the purchase of potatoes for the starch factories, the speculators on the market have pushed that market up to that same extent, probably 40 cents a barrel. It is quite generous of this Congress to give the speculators that sort of a break.

Mr. HOPE. Let me say to the gentleman that potatoes are the only agricultural commodity not included under the general price support legislation. They are in this bill in a very limited way. The price support program as far as potatoes are concerned, after this bill is enacted, will be a very minor program and will be less than the support of any other type of agricultural commodity. In fact, they stand in a class by themselves in that respect.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Going back to cotton-acreage allocation, as I understand from reading the conference report, there are alternate formulas to be used in the apportionment of acreage in the State?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the State committee then, after the national allotment has been made to the States, may determine which formula will be used?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, that being true, one State, of course, could have one formula and another State could have another, meaning, of course, that the State committees could make a determination which formula would be more advantageous to that State.

Mr. HOPE. Well, to the farms; that is, the committee would have the latitude to decide which formula might more nearly fit the needs of the cotton farmers of that State.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, the State committee, as I understand from the report, may determine whether or not to allocate acreage direct to the farms or to follow present law and allocate it to the counties, to be in turn allocated to the farms.

Mr. HOPE. Well, there are those alternatives, that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And that decision can be made by the State committee.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, there is a provision, I believe, for the releasing of unplanted acreage.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Does that mean that a farmer in a county can release acres which he does not intend to plant this year back to the county committee to be reallocated within the county?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. If acres are released, does the farm lose that acreage for future consideration or does the farm keep it?

Mr. HOPE. It does not lose any rights that it might have had by reason of existing law; in other words, it has the same rights whether the acreage is released or not as far as future years are concerned.

Mr. HARRIS. If there are acres released back to the county committee to be reallocated which cannot be used within that county, do I understand authority is given to let such unused acres go back to the State for reallocation to some other place where it might be used?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the provision with reference to the releasing of unallocated acres within the county to the State to be allocated somewhere else? Would you explain that provision?

Mr. HOPE. What does the gentleman mean by "something else"?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, for instance, under present law, under the 17,910,000 allocation, a county, for instance, gets a certain allotment which could not be allocated within that county; in other words, the county got more acreage allocated to it than it could allocate to farms under the law. Is it not true that the committee has adopted a provision that such acreage could go back to the State?

Mr. HOPE. Well, there is this provision in the legislation:

Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this act.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the provision that I had reference to, and I asked the question for explanation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Is it not true that this bill actually provides for a greater reduction in national acreage than the legislation we passed last year?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, this cotton legislation has my reluctant support. It has my support because of the fact it goes as far, in terms of increasing national acreage, as we can rationally go to relieve cotton farmers beltwide without identifying them by size or type of operation. Moreover, it is a partial answer to the inequity which present application of the 5-year base period for allocations among States imposes upon California. The fact that it is only a partial answer to the California problem reflects the relative numerical voting strength of Western State Congressmen and Senators on the two Agricultural Committees as compared to the numerical representation from other cotton areas. Faced with the hard fact of this disparity of representation on important committees, we compromised.

I am most disturbed about those aspects of the bill which relate to intrastate allocations among counties and farmers.

The bill establishes alternate methods of intrastate distribution. The State committee can assume the function of distributing acres directly to farms according to a formula which is basically a farm history concept, or it can distribute acreages to counties for distribution by county committees according to the same formula or by the use of the cropland concept which governed previous allocation.

In applying the 65-40 history formula, the proposed law reintroduces the once discarded concept of cropland to establish a ceiling on individual farm grants to 50 percent of cropland. This limitation is of no significance in increasing or decreasing any State's acreage, but it can have important effects, insofar as the individual farm is concerned. In my opinion, it will operate in California to the disadvantage of the typical medium or small cotton farmer who purely, because of the necessities of capital investment in California in water, land improvement, and equipment, must get both feet wet in cotton, so to speak, if he farms cotton at all. Larger growers are more diversified, not because they are better farmers, but because they do not need each year's income for food and clothing and debt retirement and can afford to speculate with other more potentially remunerative crops with some of their acreages.

The injury of the reassertion of the cropland concept in this limitation feature is compounded by the fact that a new definition of cropland is adopted which permits, I am informed, the inclusion of some but not all of acres excluded under existing law. This reported uneven repeal of the formula for adjusting cropland will penalize small and medium growers in my area by reason of differential treatment of orchard and vineyard as compared to lands which are nonirrigable or planted to other support program crops.

I also feel that the law proposed is not adequate in defining the basis on which unallotted acres will be distributed among counties in the event the State adopts the direct State-to-farm method of distribution until the 65-40 percent requirements are met. Such distribution

should be on a formula closely equivalent to the 5-year acreage history. The law can be so interpreted, but I would prefer that such interpretation be spelled out. Moreover, the alternative method of State breakdown to counties initially for farm distribution should be applied to allocate among counties strictly on the basis of the basic 5-year calculation. The language in the bill indicates that such application would be permitted, but the language is somewhat loose.

I am alerting my growers to insist upon these interpretations, and I am urging them to collect the necessary data to determine their position on the various acts of discretion permitted the State and county committees, to wit, distribution from State to farm versus State to county, distribution by county according to history versus distribution according to cropland.

Finally I would like to say that I think the Farm Bureau and Western Cotton Growers Association did an excellent job in securing resolution of the differences of opinion existing among cotton area representatives as to a proper distribution of added acreages among States. It was indicated that no legislation could be secured without beltwide agreement on that subject, and a compromise agreement was reached on that phase of the problem with the active cooperation of these organizations.

The committees of the Congress are to be congratulated for their untiring efforts to arrive at legislation relating to the 1954 crop in a situation of urgency created by the proximity of the planting season. No better testimonial could be secured for the diligence of Congress in support of an argument that most of its Members are overworked and underpaid.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, while this is a bill which has to do with support prices, that part to which I address myself, having to do with cotton, is essentially a redistribution of acreage inside the industry itself, and this bill is, in the opinion of those of us living in the area into which cotton has moved, a great improvement over the original bill.

We think it unfortunate that the conference felt it necessary to write in the prohibition which appears as the top sentence on page 2 of the conference report—actually beginning briefly on page 1—but we are not constrained to make an issue of this. We can only point out that whenever an attempt is made to protect, or to force monopolies by legislation, it is the commodity itself which suffers eventually, as cotton will suffer from the development of synthetics if the unwillingness persists, in refusing to recognize the same trend in cotton, which has, in reverse, worked to the benefit of the South, in other commodities.

On behalf of the cotton growers of the area I represent, I thank the members of the committee and of the conference, for an improved bill. I refer to the cotton sections.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is true that the Federal Government on loans to cotton has not lost any money over a period of 20 years?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to ask one question on a subject which the gentleman has partially covered, but my people are very much concerned about it. What is the largest amount of acreage reduction any one farmer can be compelled to take under the arrangement presently agreed to?

Mr. HOPE. There is nothing in the law itself that would enable me to answer that question directly, but the grower is entitled to an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage for the preceding 3 years or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted in any one of these 3 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He cannot be compelled to take less than that?

Mr. HOPE. No. I should say to the gentleman there are four States where the State allotment they will receive will probably not enable them to carry out that provision in full, but the gentleman's State is not one of them.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman this question then: Does the gentleman think that under this arrangement every farmer will have a reasonable chance to get an adequate cotton acreage for the current year?

Mr. HOPE. That depends on the gentleman's definition of "adequate," but I think I can say that it does give him an opportunity to get a reasonable cotton acreage, taking into account the need for acreage reduction.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. May I say that this bill is not as good as we would like to have it, but it is much better than the Senate bill and it is better than the House bill was last fall for all cotton areas concerned. I do think more consideration should be given to climatic conditions, green bugs, boll weevils, hail, and diversification. We should give some consideration to working out our surplus—working out some kind of trade. There should be more consideration of family sized farms and there should be more local control. We should consider the planted acreage rather than the harvested acreage.

I should like to offer congratulations to Mr. HOPE, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BELCHER, and the two Oklahoma Senators. I do think we ought to be sure that the reapportionment may be made at any time prior to the end of the planting season. Will that be the case?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the committee, if he feels that this bill, together with existing law, will enable the Department in making allotments to give reasonably adequate consideration to people in the drought area who were unable to plant their cotton on account of drought conditions.

Mr. HOPE. I think so. It was certainly the intention of the committee that that should be done.

Mr. MAHON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that perhaps the average farmer feels that the total number of acres by which the national allotment is increased in this bill is reasonably satisfactory. The real problem will come in the administration and the distribution of those acres. Does the gentleman think that is correct?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is true; yes.

Mr. MAHON. The committee recognizes, of course, that this bill will disappoint large numbers of cotton producers because many producers will have little opportunity to participate in the distribution of additional acres. Many producers, of course, will be pleased. I have studied the new bill carefully and I think I can see the weaknesses as well as the good points in this measure. It seems to me a lot of difficulties and misunderstandings will arise. The committee, of course, has had a difficult problem. Under the circumstances is this the best that the committee could work out in conference on this bill?

Mr. HOPE. I always hesitate to say that what we have done is the best, but I feel I am justified in saying to the gentleman that the conference committee did what I believe was a reasonably good job in dealing with the situation confronting us. Of course, we could not do what many Members would like to have seen done.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. We all realize that this bill represents a compromise of conflicting interests in 20 States which produce cotton. There is one question I would like to ask the chairman. The bill which passed the House last July provided approximately 991,000 acres for California, which represented a reduction of 27½ percent below what was grown in 1952. The bill which passed the Senate provided approximately 936,000 acres which was a reduction of 34 percent. But in neither of the bills was there any restriction as far as history up to the total amount provided. But in reading the conference report, I note a number of new additions but one in particular to which I would like to call your attention is the sentence beginning at the bottom of page 1 running over to the top of page 2:

The additional acreage made available to the States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments.

Does that mean that the 22,879 acres allotted to the State of California under

that particular clause are not to be counted as history in the future?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HUNTER. I personally object to that, but, as I pointed out, this is a matter of compromise. But it points out the fundamental fact that this program in general does not recognize trends and the fact that in California and Arizona, where there has been a tremendous growth in population and an increase in land use, more cotton has been produced and it tends to freeze the geographical pattern of planting as it has existed in the past.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not true that in the last year in which there was cotton-acreage allotment in 1950 that there was a large surplus of cotton being carried over, as we have heard today, and that many people were worried about this large surplus of cotton? Is that not the case?

Mr. HOPE. That is true; yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that by the end of that planting season with the crop that was made, there was actually a cotton shortage and it was necessary to impose export quotas on cotton?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct. Of course, it simply illustrates the fact that none of us can anticipate what nature will do in a situation of this kind. All we can do is to enact legislation to make these allocations and allotments on what we think is a sound basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, adjustments like this are certainly not immoral—they do not compromise the basic fact at all and these adjustments must be made because no mathematical formula is possible to really figure these things out.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas and his committee for the work they have done on this very difficult problem. I agree with him that there are certain parts of this which are compromises, and probably do not please everybody, but by and large, I think, they have done a very fine job and I compliment the gentleman and his committee.

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in Alabama are ready to plant their crop. Some immediate action is necessary. This conference report is a long way from what many of us want and need, but since it does represent the best possible solution we can get at this time, I want to add my endorsement in support of this legislation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. May I ask the distinguished chairman a question with reference to section 4, subsection (e), and the durum allotment? Can this allotment only be extended to farmers who produced durum wheat during the past 3 years? Does it only apply where wheat has been produced?

Mr. HOPE. That was the intention of the committee, that it would apply only to farms which had been producing durum wheat. Of course, any farmer who has a wheat allotment can put all of his allotted acreage into durum whether he has grown it before or not. I think there may be a considerable shift to durum, due to the great advantage as far as price is concerned at this time. But the provision in the law itself contemplates only that these allotments for durum wheat will be made only on farms where durum has been grown sometime during the last 3 years.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Federation of Post Office Clerks, relating to salary increases for postal clerks:

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT LAKE ANDES, S. DAK.,
SEPTEMBER 13, 1953**

Whereas there was held in Lake Andes, S. Dak., a meeting composed of post office clerks from the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and North Dakota for the purpose of reviewing some favorable legislation in the 2d session of the 83d Congress; and

Whereas it is a known fact that the cost of living has increased considerably in the past 3 years causing a hardship on people living on a fixed salary or income: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record in favor of a salary increase of \$800 for postal employees to offset the present increased living costs, merit promotion in the postal service and union recognition, legislation now pending in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent Senators and Representatives of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and North Dakota with a request that they urge the Congress to hold early and favorable hearings on the above-named legislation so that it may be enacted at an early date and it is also requested that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MARVIN R. KECK, *President*.

GEORGE L. CLARK, *Secretary*.

LAKE ANDES, S. DAK., September 13, 1953.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the conference report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present; a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation from the House Government Operations Committee.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. POFF.

Copy to Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration to be effective as of this date.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 412), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Banking and Currency: WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.

Committee on the Judiciary: RICHARD H. POFF, of Virginia.

Committee on Government Operations: GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

**COMMEMORATING COINS OF THE
SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE LOUISIANA
PURCHASE**

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent

to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 1917, an act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out all after "Sec. 3." down to and including line 13 and insert "Such coins shall be disposed of at par by banks or trust companies selected by the Louisiana Purchase One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society."

Page 2, line 24, strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

Page 3, line 16, strike out all after "hereof" down to and including "sesquicentennial" in line 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. Does this mean that we will have a chance of getting commemorative coins to commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the city of New York as well?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will be patient for about 3 minutes, I will answer that question by action instead of words.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**COMMEMORATION OF TERCENTEN-
NIAL CELEBRATION OF THE
FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF
NORTHAMPTON, MASS.**

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., to be held in June 1954, there shall be coined not to exceed 1 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 100,000.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1954, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the city of

Northampton, Mass., or its duly authorized agent, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds from the disposition of such coins shall be used for such purposes related to the observance of such tercentennial celebration as the city of Northampton, Mass., shall direct.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the processes of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall so far as applicable apply to the coinage herein authorized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Change the period at the end of the first sentence of section 2 to a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATION TO COMMEMORATE THE TERCENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the foundation of the city of New York, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces shall not be less than 200,000: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such committee in connection with the observance of said tercentennial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of ma-

terial, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to take a few moments to urge the enactment of this bill S. 2474, calling for the minting of a coin to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

In the other body where it received unanimous approval, it was cosponsored by the distinguished gentlemen from New York, Senators IVES and LEHMAN.

It is identical with my bill, H. R. 5921, which was cosponsored here by my distinguished colleagues from New York City, Representatives HOLTZMAN, DELANEY, HELLER, KEOGH, KELLY, CELLER, DORN, ROONEY, POWELL, COUDERT, DONOVAN, KLEIN, ROOSEVELT, JAVITS, FINE, DOLLINGER, BUCKLEY, FINO, and RAY. It has had the support of our good friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and his fellow members of that committee. We are indebted to all of them for their wholehearted cooperation.

I am sure that this House will agree that this is a fitting tribute to the great city of New York on the part of the American people.

Three hundred years ago this community was brought into being as a trading post on the North American continent. It soon became the provincial capital of the New Netherlands.

It later served as the national capital of the United States of America and as the capital of the State of New York. Today it is the capital city of the world.

I do not intend to take the time of the House by at this time recounting the many chapters in the great story of the city of New York. Every American is thoroughly familiar with that history, with the rise of business, industry, and trade that go to make up a part of the city and certainly, they are thoroughly familiar with the cultural institutions and the civic and charitable endeavors that make it not only a great city, but a city with a great heart.

When Peter Stuyvesant and his council in 1653 proclaimed a grant of municipal government, placing city affairs in charge of two burgomasters—mayors—five schepens—councilmen—and a schout—prosecutor—western democracy was born in America, because this municipal council was the first democratic institution on this continent.

The international significance of the event is emphasized by the fact that the United Nations capital was erected on

land made available for that purpose by our city.

Another interesting but little known item in our history is that a Dutch farmer by the name of Klaes Martensen van Roosevelt entered this great country in 1650 through what has since become the greatest seaport in the world, New York Harbor. He little dreamed that he was destined to be the common ancestor of seven Presidents of the United States—James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To take a place alongside its great institutions of learning, this year the city will bring into being the first new medical college to be organized in this country in more than 25 years, the Albert Einstein Medical College. That could never have been accomplished except for the cooperation and financial support of our great municipality.

The entire Nation, by enactment of this bill, joins in this splendid historical celebration of what was in turn a Dutch city, a British city, and finally an American city holding high for all the world to see, the beaming light of liberty.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman; and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JAVITS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

(Mr. REED of New York, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a summary of the bill incorporating the President's recommendations for amendments to title V of the Social Security Act.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the President transmitted to the Congress his recommendations to improve the health of the American people. Those proposals included a recommendation for a simplified formula for grants-in-aid dealing with health, child welfare, and rehabilitation of the disabled.

I am introducing immediately a bill which embodies the President's recommendations with respect to the three grants for maternal and child health, crippled children's, and child welfare services now authorized under title V of the Social Security Act. This bill permits the States to use greater initiative and take more responsibility in the administration of their program for these services.

As recommended by the President, the States are aided in inverse proportion to their financial capacity. They are also helped in proportion to their child population to extend and improve children's services for health and welfare provided by the grants-in-aid program. Finally, a portion of Federal funds is set aside for

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued January 25, 1954

For actions of January 22, 1954

83rd-2nd, No. 12

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11	Forestry.....5	R. E. A.....3
Animal diseases.....7	Labeling.....17	Section 32.....2
Banking and currency.....10	Livestock.....7,13	Statehood.....9
Coffee.....19	Meat packers.....6	Synthetic fibers.....17
C. E. A.....4	Personnel.....3,15,20	Trade, foreign.....3
Cotton.....2	Potatoes.....2	Treaties.....8,14
Dairy industry.....21	President's budget.....1	Vesicular exanthema.....7
Export control.....3	Prices, farm.....13	Veterans' benefits.....15,16,20
Farm problems.....12	Reports.....3	Wheat.....2
Fisheries.....18	Retirement.....3	Wool.....4,13

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate completed congressional action on cotton-allotments, potato, wheat bill. Senate received President's budget message.

SENATE

1. PRESIDENT'S BUDGET. Received the President's Budget message (H. Doc. 264) (pp. 595-6).
2. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 6665, establishing cotton acreage allotments for 1954, authorizing purchase of Irish potatoes with section 32 funds, and permitting the Secretary to allot additional acreage for special wheat types in short supply (pp. 601-3). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. REPORTS. Received the following annual and special reports (p. 596):
Operations of REA
Export control operations
On retirement provisions for Federal personnel, pursuant to Public Law 555, 82nd Cong.
4. WOOL. Agreed to committee amendments to S. 2313, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act so as to include wool among the commodities regulated, and then passed over this bill (pp. 603-4).
5. FORESTRY. Passed as reported S. 1399, authorizing sale of certain improvements on Forest Service land in Ariz. to the Salt River Valley Water Users Assn. (p. 604).
Passed without amendment S. 1577, authorizing the exchange of Forest Service lands in Eagle County, Colo. (pp. 604-5).
6. MEAT PACKERS. Discussed and, at the request of Butler (Md.), passed over S. 2404, authorizing the Secretary to require reasonable bonds from meat packers (p. 605).
7. ANIMAL DISEASES. Passed as reported S. 2583, authorizing payment of indemnities to owners of swine destroyed during July 1952 because of being infected with or exposed to vesicular exanthema. (This bill affects only Oregon) (pp. 605-6).

8. TREATIES. Sen. Wiley spoke opposing S. J. Res. 1, the Bricker amendment to restrict the President's treaty power, and inserted communications opposing this measure (pp. 629-45, 600-1).
Sen. Bricker spoke in favor of S. J. Res. 1 (pp. 606-16).

9. STATEHOOD. Sen. Anderson inserted President Eisenhower's statement favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska (p. 603).

10. BANKING AND CURRENCY. The Rules and Administration Committee reported without amendment S. Res. 182, to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, etc., and with amendment S. Res. 183, to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (S. Repts. 867, 873) (p. 596).

11. RECESSED until Mon., Jan. 25 (p. 645).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. FARM PROBLEMS. Sen. Thye inserted a constituent's letter outlining and discussing some of the problems confronting farmers and criticizing Secretary Benson's recommendations (pp. A472-3).

13. FARM PRICES. Rep. Patman inserted excerpts from his weekly letters during the past few weeks including one entitled, "Farm Depression" and one "Wool and Cattle Program" (pp. A474-6).

14. TREATIES. Rep. Smith inserted Raymond Moley's recent Newsweek article favoring the proposed Bricker amendment to restrict the President's treaty power (pp. A478-9).

Rep. Heller inserted a New York Times editorial opposing this proposed amendment (pp. A479-80).

15. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Teague stating that "the administration, and particularly the Justice Department, has made a continuous assault on the Veterans' Preference Act," and criticizing the attempt to place a rider on the department appropriation bills which would give authority to "terminate the employment of any officer or employee" (p. A479).

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. VETERANS' BENEFITS. S. 2792, by Sen. Griswold, to enable World War II veterans to qualify for benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 of which they would otherwise be deprived because of recall to active service in the Armed Forces; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 597).

17. LABELING. S. 2796, by Sen. Potter, to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules and regulations for labeling certain fabrics containing synthetic fibers; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 597). Remarks of author (p. 597).

18. FISHERIES. S. 2802, by Sen. Saltonstall (for himself and others), to further encourage the distribution of fishery products; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 597). Remarks of author (p. 597-8).

with our free-world allies if we are to find security against the Communist threat. That is not the way the fight started. But that is what it has come to.

Under the circumstances, America cannot afford a Bricker amendment. And our Massachusetts legislators play a useful role in refusing to give it countenance.

[From the Long Island (N. Y.) Newsday of January 11, 1954]

BRICKER'S AT IT AGAIN

According to the usual unidentified Washington insiders, one of the first orders of business for the new Congress will be Senator BRICKER'S proposed constitutional amendment. The Ohio nationalist got his plan through the Senate Judiciary Committee last year, but it met stern rebuffs from President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, Attorney General Brownell and Mutual Security Administrator Stassen.

BRICKER'S proposal, considerably watered down since he first made it, would severely limit the President's power to negotiate treaties and executive agreements. Specifically it says: 1. Any treaty in conflict with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

The indications are that BRICKER is trying again to reach a compromise with the administration. He flew to Washington 2 weeks ago for talks with Dulles and Brownell, and he was at the White House for further talks last week before Congress opened.

What kind of compromise can be reached we do not know. The President said last year that he was willing to bargain, but he would not accept anything that undermined his authority in foreign affairs. This is exactly what BRICKER plans to do.

Section 1 of his plan is harmless, as far as we can see, but completely unnecessary. One of the beauties of our Constitution is that it is not loaded with a lot of meaningless words. To incorporate into it an amendment which says what the Constitution already says is a waste. The point that no treaty in conflict with the Constitution can be valid was settled by the Supreme Court 174 years ago, and had been regularly reaffirmed.

Section 2 is the dangerous clause. Although innocent enough to those who want to believe the best of everyone and everything, its purpose is generally recognized as an attempt to turn us back to pre-Constitution days when a State could nullify a treaty made by the Federal Government. Merlo J. Pusey, Pulitzer prize winning biographer of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, writes that this section would forbid the making of treaties concerning many of the matters that are customarily covered in treaties of friendship and commerce unless the administration were willing to seek ratification by the States as well as by Congress.

In these days when quick decisions are vital to our national security, BRICKER wants to give us 49 voices in foreign affairs rather than 1. He wants to extend the time needed to ratify treaties from a few precious days to perhaps years. The effect would be to take from the Nation its decisive role in world affairs. Initiative, which President Eisenhower told Congress Thursday we had finally gained, would be thrown away.

DEFINITIONS NEEDED

BRICKER'S sincerity and patriotic intentions cannot be doubted. He was aroused to action, and presumably fear, by such executive agreements as Potsdam and Yalta. Executive agreements do not need Senate confirmation.

But Congress already has control of treaties, and can veto executive agreements by

tightening the purse strings. Most agreements take money, and the President is severely restricted on what he can do with funds already appropriated.

What is needed, if anything, is not a restriction on the executive powers, but clearer definitions of what those powers are. Congress can, with a great deal more study than it has so far given the amendment, draw a firm line between treaties and executive agreements. This has never been done.

If properly drawn, such a measure—not being a Constitutional amendment—would not shackle the President, but only help prevent abuses. Congress has plenty of time. Hasty action will do irreparable harm to the United States.

ANTI-BRICKER AMENDMENT RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS, SEPTEMBER 5, 1953

Whereas the negotiation of treaties and executive agreements by the President and ratification by the Senate as provided in our Constitution has on the whole worked effectively in our foreign relations and protected the rights of our citizens and our international interests; and

Whereas the proposed so-called Bricker amendment to the Constitution threatens to interfere with a procedure which has proved its worth during the whole history of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish war veterans of the United States of America, assembled at 58th annual national encampment in Chicago, Ill., September 2-6, 1953, oppose the proposed Bricker amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON before the Pennsylvania Citizens' Association, in Philadelphia, Pa., Wednesday, January 20, 1954.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Erwin Freiheit, of Lake City, Minn., on the subject of farm problems.

By Mr. BEALL:

Editorial entitled "We Accept" published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1954, relating to the proposed Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Parkway.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Military Experts Resist Budget Ax," published in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, January 20, 1954.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article from the newspaper Labor, dated January 23, 1954, announcing agreement by railroad unions for further improvements in the Railroad Retirement Act.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES COMMEMORATING THE TERCENTEN- NIAL CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-

cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., which was, on page 2, line 7, after "coins", where it appears the first time, insert "Provided, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have taken up this matter with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Senator in charge of the bill. The amendment made by the House of Representatives is entirely agreeable to the proponents of the bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was agreed to.

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as a number of Senators have other engagements, I ask unanimous consent that a privileged matter, the conference report on the cotton-acreage bill, be submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of January 20, 1954, pp. 462-463, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation, for the information of the Senate, regarding the changes which the conferees have recommended to the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the conference committee, composed of 15 Members of the Senate and 13 Members of the House of Representatives, met, it was decided to substitute new language.

The report submitting the new language is signed by all the conferees of both Houses.

We agree that we have done the best that could be done. We have provided for an increase in the cotton acreage to be planted this year—an increase from 17,910,448 acres to 21,379,342 acres.

The conference report seems to be generally approved by all representatives from the cotton-growing areas of the country.

I shall not attempt to go into the details of the report unless it is necessary. If there is a request for a detailed explanation, there are present at this time members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who come from cotton-growing States, and they will go into the details.

However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no objection to the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of orderly procedure, I believe a statement should be made regarding the changes as finally recommended by the conferees.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], each of whom represents a cotton-growing State, are present at this time. Either one of them is perfectly competent to explain the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, insofar as the provisions contained in the Senate version of the bill, respecting the 1954 cotton crop are concerned, no significant changes have been made in conference. The same methods of apportionment to States, as now contained in the Senate bill, have been retained in conference. We have added two gadgets, one which would permit the State committees the option of allotting the additional acreage provided for 1954 to counties in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the national acreage instead of allotting it directly to the farmer. Should that method be followed the county committees in turn would have the option of apportioning such additional county acreage to farms either in the manner now provided by law or in a manner similar to that provided by the Senate bill for allotment by the State committee to farms. That was done in order to assist in having a more equitable distribution of cotton acreage in the States of Texas and Oklahoma and possibly Arkansas. The other gadget would permit the cotton acreage already allocated to counties but not to farms because all farms in those counties had already received their maximum allotments to be reallocated by the State committee. The purpose is to use these frozen allotments in other areas of the State where they are needed.

The bill has also been amended so as to contain permanent legislation. The permanent legislation has to do with the distribution by the States, as well as the counties, of their respective reserves of cotton acreage, so they can be used by the county or by the State to prevent hardships or inequities.

Another permanent provision was placed in the bill which would make it optional with the county committees, with the Secretary of Agriculture's approval, either to use the cropland basis of distribution as now provided in the law or the historical basis.

There was another provision affecting the States of California and Arizona to a certain extent in respect to future cotton-acreage allotments. Senators will recall that we provided for a 59,000-plus-acre increase so as to give California and Arizona not less than a 66 per-

cent acreage allotment of the acreage they planted in 1952. The bill provides that this extra acreage of 59,000 shall not be used in the future in computing and determining the amount of cotton acreage which those two States shall receive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That provision applies only to the extra acreage, does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that the conference report was unanimously agreed to and signed by all the conferees of both houses?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. This is the first time since I have been in the Senate that the entire membership of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed on a conference committee and all conferees have signed the conference report—a unique situation to say the least.

Mr. President, those are the significant changes. I may say that the 50-percent-cropland limitation as provided in the Senate bill was modified so as to allow the State committees to fix a limitation of less than 50 percent, if they saw fit so to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just this moment received a statement prepared by the counsel for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which sets forth all the differences between the conference report on House bill 6665 and the Senate amendment to House bill 6665, which was the language of the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point. I would have submitted it earlier, but I have only just received it. We have been working against time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6665 AND THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6665

The conference substitute for the Senate amendment to H. R. 6665 differs from the Senate amendment in the following respects:

(1) The conference substitute provides that the 59,374 acres allotted to Arizona and California to bring their allotments up to 66 percent of their 1952 planted acreage will not be counted in computing future State acreage allotments.

(2) The conference substitute gives the State committee the option of allotting the additional acreage provided for 1954 by the first section of the bill (except the 4,968 acres allotted to Florida under that section) to counties in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the national acreage allotment instead of allotting it directly to farms in the manner provided by the Senate substitute. If the State committee in any State should so elect to apportion such additional acreage to counties rather than to farms, the county committees under the conference substitute would then have the option of apportioning such additional county acreage to farms either in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the county acreage allotment or in a manner similar to that provided by the Senate amendment for allotment by the State committee to farms.

(3) The Senate amendment limited the additional acreage to be allotted to any farm for 1954 under the Senate provision mentioned in (2) above to 50 percent of the cropland on the farm. The conference substitute would permit the State committee to fix this limitation at such level not in excess of 50 percent as appears required by various factors affecting production in the State. This would permit the Western State committees, for instance, to fix this limitation at 50 percent, while other State committees might fix it at 40 percent if they felt conditions in their respective State so required.

(4) The conference substitute redefines cropland for the purpose of the limitation discussed in (3) above to make it conform to the definition of cropland contained in the 1954 marketing quota regulations issued by the Secretary (18 F. R. 7530), thereby excluding "any land which constitutes or will constitute * * * a wind-erosion hazard to the community and also excluding bearing orchards and vineyards (except the acreage of cropland therein) and plowable noncrop open pasture." This change enables the Department to use the cropland information that it now has, rather than requiring it to determine acreage devoted to orchards and vineyards, which would delay allotment of the additional acreage.

(5) The conference substitute permits allotment by the State committee of any acreage in the State which has not been allotted because of the highest planted acreage limitation contained in section 344 (f) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. In certain counties, due to a shift from cotton growing to other types of farming, the county allotment, after deducting the full county reserve, has been more than sufficient to provide each old cotton farm with 100 percent of its highest planted acreage. The conference substitute would permit allotment of the excess acreage in those counties.

(6) The conference substitute makes the following changes in the provision of the Senate amendment relating to the surrender and reallocation of acreage:

(a) It would make it effective in 1955 as well as 1954.

(b) It would make it effective with respect to long-staple cotton.

(c) It would make it unnecessary to determine, for the purposes of computing farm history, whether the surrendered acreage was or was not planted. This determination would involve considerable administrative difficulty without affecting the total acreage allotted to any State or county. In determining future State and county allotments, the acreage would be counted as provided in the Senate bill only if it were actually planted.

(7) The conference substitute adopts the permanent provisions of the House bill which would be effective beginning with the 1955 crop, and would (a) permit State and county reserves to be used to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship, and (b) permit allotment of the county acreage allotment to farms on the basis of their 3-year history, if the county committee and the Secretary so see fit, rather than on the basis of the small farm and percentage factor provisions contained in sections 344 (f) (1) and 344 (f) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

(8) The conference substitute revises the provision of the Senate amendment which would permit increases in marketing quotas for kinds of wheat in short supply to make several technical changes, limit it to the 1954 and 1955 crops, and limit use of the additional acreage to the production of the class of subclass of wheat in short supply.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make 3 or 4 brief comments.

First, the amount of acreage for 1954 proposed by the Senate bill is left unchanged by the conference report. That amount is 21,379,342 acres. In other words, the conference report does not depart from the amount of cotton acreage fixed for 1954 by the Senate committee and by the bill which passed the Senate.

The second comment I should like to make is that two provisions, which did not apply to cotton acreage, were added in the Senate committee and approved by the Senate. One such provision is applicable to durum wheat. It was offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The other provision is that section 32 funds may be used in the case of surpluses in the production of Irish potatoes. Those two amendments were placed in the Senate bill by the Senate committee and were approved by the Senate. They were left in by the conference, and are in the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. There was a slight change in the wheat amendment. The provision is now limited to 2 years. As it left the Senate it would have been a permanent provision. The Department of Agriculture deems it advisable to increase the acreage of durum wheat this year. Durum wheat is in very short supply, and is selling for about \$4 a bushel, or approximately double the price support level. As Senators know, durum wheat is used in the manufacture of macaroni and spaghetti.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

A third change which was made, and which has not been referred to, was a very minor one. It was made at the unanimous request and with the unanimous approval of Senators and House Members from the States which produce extra-long-staple cotton, formerly called sea island cotton. That change was to make available and applicable to extra-long-staple cotton or sea island cotton the provisions of the bill for 1954 and 1955 with reference to the surrender of acreage and the reallocation of such acreage by the county committees, so that farmers who produce extra-long-staple cotton will have applicable in their counties the same provision which will be applicable under the bill as to the years 1954 and 1955, in the case of ordinary cotton. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that since the same areas frequently produce both kinds of cotton, a situation should not be left under which the new method of release of acreage and reallocation of such acreage now made applicable by this bill to short-staple cotton would not have been applicable to extra-long-staple cotton. Under the terms of the conference report, that provision will be equally applicable to both types of cotton.

I believe those were the principal changes made in the bill in conference, which have not already been mentioned by other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MINING AREAS OF WYOMING

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram which I received from Mr. William L. Thomas, recording secretary of Local 8078, United Mine Workers of America, Stansbury, Wyo. The telegram deals with unemployment and the resultant economic conditions in that area.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., January 21, 1954.
LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: Due to slow working times in the mines followed by recent reduction working forces by Union Pacific Coal Co. An extreme emergency exists in Rock Springs area, and many of our coal miners are in dire circumstances. This condition is serious. It has been called to our attention that several families, some with as many as 11 children, are on starvation diets. It is a policy of our local union that no one shall suffer, but as our finances are limited we are calling for your help in trying to secure surplus commodities to help remedy this condition. We feel that inasmuch as the stockmen can purchase surplus grain to feed their livestock that we should be allowed the same privilege to feed the mouths of hungry people. It is also our contention that the Government should share in standing that expense of this project as promised in the recent speech of the President where he stated that in cases of emergency immediate and direct action should be taken to meet the needs of the people we wish to impress upon you that this is indeed an emergency and that anything you can do to help us will be deeply appreciated. Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. THOMAS,
Recording Secretary, Local 8078,
U. M. W. of A., Stansbury, Wyo.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL EISENHOWER IN SUPPORT OF ADMISSION OF ALASKA AND HAWAII INTO THE UNION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the statement which General Eisenhower made at Denver, Colo., on September 17, 1950, in support of admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. The statement appeared in the Denver Post of November 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches, General Dwight D. Eisenhower said Saturday in a brief talk to 1,500 Denverites gathered at the freedom bell.

The famed war and peacetime leader declared admission of the two Territories is in conformity with the American way of life granting them self-government and equal voice in national affairs.

Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood will serve to the people of the world as a "practical symbol that America practices what it preaches," Eisenhower said. He said he hoped Congress would soon pass admission legislation now pending before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no resolutions coming over from the previous day, the morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate—and I should add that I have discussed the subject with the minority leader—after the call of the calendar, the Senate will remain in session for the purpose of giving Senators an opportunity to make remarks and submit matters for the RECORD. Because of the heavy snowfall which we have already had and which it is expected will continue during the remainder of the day, it is the intention of the majority leader to move at an early hour that the Senate recess to Monday so that Senators and their staffs and the members of the press and employees of the Senate will not have to contend with the rush-hour traffic in the heavy snow this afternoon.

Therefore, when the call of the calendar has been completed, and when Senators have had an opportunity to speak, it will be the intention of the majority leader to move that the Senate recess until Monday.

On Monday the Senate will go into executive session for the purpose of considering the nominations on the Executive Calendar and the Korean Treaty.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Korean treaty and the printed hearings have been placed on the desks of all Senators, I hope all Senators will have an opportunity to study the material over the weekend so that they may be prepared to begin the discussion of the Korean Treaty on Monday.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The calendar is now in order. The Secretary will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT TO INCLUDE WOOL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish we could have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to make the explanation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe the bill should go over until either the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, Mr. President, there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to the bill, but I do not believe its title is sufficiently clear to give an accurate account of what the bill provides.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was one of the Senators in committee who asked that the bill be held up until I could have an opportunity to clear it with those in my State who are interested in wool and with certain representatives of the wool trade in other States and to ascertain whether they desired to have the bill enacted into law.

Under the present arrangement, wool tops are subject to future trading, but wool is not subject to such trading. The wool trade and the wool producers thought that all wool products ought to be subject to future trading, as cotton and hundreds of other agricultural commodities are. Because such suggestions came from the wool trade, I had some questions about the bill, as did the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. We wanted to determine whether the bill would in any way damage the producers of wool.

I am satisfied now that it is a good bill and that it would not damage the wool trade in any way. Therefore, I have withdrawn the objection I had to the bill in committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are the various wool interests agreed on the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are.

Mr. YOUNG. That does not happen very often, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, in line 4, after the word "inserting," to strike out "wool" and insert "wool,"; and after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "wool", after the comma following "(Irish potatoes)."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the opinion of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle, the bill is of such importance that it should be scheduled for debate by the Senate, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS ON NATIONAL FOREST LAND IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 1399) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "shall", to insert "if sufficient for the purpose"; and in line 10, after the word "Forest", to insert "If the development and improvement of such ranger station cannot be accomplished without the use of funds in excess of such proceeds, such proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to sell to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association of Arizona, for cash, at a fair appraised value to be determined by him, the following described improvements on national forest lands situated in an unsurveyed portion of township 4 north, range 12 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, estimated to be within the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 20 of that township in Gila County, State of Arizona.

All buildings and other physical improvements owned by the United States and under the administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, situated at the reclamation settlement of Roosevelt, Ariz.

The proceeds of such sale or sales shall, if sufficient for the purpose, be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the develop-

ment and improvement of a Forest Service ranger station located elsewhere in the Tonto National Forest. If the development and improvement of such ranger station cannot be accomplished without the use of funds in excess of such proceeds, such proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is present. I believe he would prefer to explain the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we believe this to be a good bill. It provides for the sale at a fair appraised value of certain Forest Service ranger station improvements located near Roosevelt, Ariz. The sale would be to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and would consist of the following improvements:

1. A 3-bedroom dwelling, built in 1935.
2. A barn, built in 1915.
3. A 2-bedroom house, built in 1915.
4. A shed, located near the barn in (2), built in 1915.
5. A fence, surrounding the house in (1), erected in 1935.
6. A sanitary system for the house in (1), constructed in 1935.
7. Part of the water system of the entire improvement development.
8. A horse corral, located near the barn in (2), built in 1935.

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association desires to use these improvements at the reclamation settlement which was built by the Reclamation Service in connection with the construction of the adjacent Roosevelt Reservoir.

The bill provides that, to the extent the money is paid to the Forest Service, it may be used by it to build a new ranger station in the vicinity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN EAGLE COUNTY, COLO.

The bill (S. 1577) to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill provides for the exchange of town lands no longer required by the Forest Service for lands within the White River National Forest which are suitable for forest purposes. The lands to be disposed of are valued at \$2,000, while the lands to be acquired are valued at \$2,500.

The Department of Agriculture has investigated the situation and has approved the bill. No objection was raised to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Public Law 290 - 83d Congress
Chapter 2 - 2d Session
H. R. 6665

AN ACT

All 68 Stat. 4.

To amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 63 Stat. 670.
7 USC 1344.

“(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) The national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton shall be increased to twenty-one million acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A) three hundred and fifteen thousand additional acres shall be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half being made to the States participating therein on the basis of their respective shares of the increased national acreage allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as may be required to provide each State a total allotment under subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The additional acreage made available to States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this paragraph (1) shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, and the additional acreage shall be apportioned to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That, if the county committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional county allotment among farms in the county, the additional acreage shall be apportioned by the county committee to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the county; if the additional acreage available to the county is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed the acreage remaining after making such increases shall be allotted to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) (3). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, if the State committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph (1) it shall apportion such additional allotment directly

Cotton acreage
allotments,
1954.
Increases; ap-
portionments.

Limitations.

All 68 Stat. 5.

Unallotted farm
acreage.

66 Stat. 759.
7 USC 1347.
Reapportion-
ment of
surrendered
acreage.

to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the State total of the farm increases so computed exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. Before apportioning such unallotted acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallotted acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section. Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

“(2) Any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment transferred under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned under this paragraph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county in determining future acreage

allotments. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply also to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act. Extra long staple cotton.
7 USC 1347.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than one hundred thousand acres but more than thirty thousand acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 per centum of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton." Reserve acreage.

SEC. 2. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In any county in which a major flood-control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest." 7 USC 1344 (h).
Reallocation of flood lands.

SEC. 3. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended, effective beginning with the 1955 crop, as follows: 7 USC 1344.
Amendments effective in 1955.

(a) By striking the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(b) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon before the word "Provided" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship:".

(c) By adding a new paragraph "6" at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such three year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3)."

SEC. 4. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 7 USC 1344.
Wheat.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any class or sub-class of wheat that a substantial difference exists in the usage or marketing outlets therefor and that the supply of such wheat for the 1953-54 and 1954-55 marketing years with respect to the 1954 crop, and for the 1954-55 and 1955-56 marketing years with respect to the Requirements for increases.

All 68 Stat. 7.

1955 crop, will be substantially short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements for such wheat for such marketing years, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such crop of wheat for farms which produced such wheat in one or more of the preceding three years to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage seeded to such class or sub-class of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, and shall not be used to increase the acreage allotment applicable to other wheat produced on farms for which such additional acreage has been allotted, nor shall such acreage be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

Irish potatoes.
Price support.

64 Stat. 42.

49 Stat. 774.

63 Stat. 1052.
Limitation.

63 Stat. 1057.
7 USC 1446.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes" (7 U. S. C. 1450), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Operations with respect to Irish potatoes authorized by section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes' (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446)."

(b) The parenthetical phrase contained in the sentence preceding the last sentence of section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" (7 U. S. C. 612c), is amended to read as follows: "(other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949)".

Approved January 30, 1954.

JANUARY 30, 1954

JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved H. R. 6665, "To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

The principal purpose of the bill is to alleviate the great hardship on many cotton farms that would result from the severe production adjustments required under existing legislation. This is accomplished by increasing the national acreage allotment and modifying the method of apportioning that allotment to farms.

The bill also would permit the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the 1954 and 1955 crops of wheat to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas for any class or subclass of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time, there is a shortage only of amber durum wheat, which is used in the milling of semolina. Semolina is a type of wheat flour that is used exclusively in the manufacture of macaroni, noodles, and spaghetti.

Finally, this legislation removes the prohibition against the use of funds provided under Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for extending assistance to the potato industry. It must be clearly understood that this action provides no basis for a program which might result in the dumping or destruction of potatoes. This is as it should be.

#####

JANUARY 30, 1954

JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved H. R. 6665, "To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

The principal purpose of the bill is to alleviate the great hardship on many cotton farms that would result from the severe production adjustments required under existing legislation. This is accomplished by increasing the national acreage allotment and modifying the method of apportioning that allotment to farms.

The bill also would permit the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the 1954 and 1955 crops of wheat to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas for any class or subclass of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time, there is a shortage only of amber durum wheat, which is used in the milling of semolina. Semolina is a type of wheat flour that is used exclusively in the manufacture of macaroni, noodles, and spaghetti.

Finally, this legislation removes the prohibition against the use of funds provided under Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for extending assistance to the potato industry. It must be clearly understood that this action provides no basis for a program which might result in the dumping or destruction of potatoes. This is as it should be.

#####

